

CHILD WELFARE LEAGUE OF AMERICA, INC.

130 EAST TWENTY-SECOND ST., NEW YORK, N. Y.

VOL. XXI, No. 4

BULLETIN

APRIL, 1942

Ancient Processes in a Scientific Age: Feeding Aspects

DR. C. ANDERSON ALDRICH

MANY of the difficulties encountered in caring for young children are, as a matter of fact, due to the disarrangement caused by the impact of our new techniques on the child's ancient mechanism.

Under average conditions, however, our youngsters born with primeval equipment gradually come to take on the sort of personality and behavior approved of in our modern world. Keeping in mind the extremely deep and wide gap between primitive life and modern city existence, it is easy to understand why the civilizing process should be difficult, and why it should take considerable time for its development. But, particularly in the last few years, we have concentrated this civilizing effort in an attempt to cram the adjustment into the first few years of life.

In this so-called "training" process the child is under the compulsion of two highly dynamic forces. The first and most primitive is made up of the growth drives. This force is undoubtedly the most exacting restraint ever imposed upon us. To grow, not only in the physical but also in an emotional and mental sense, according to his own preordained pattern, is hard discipline; but this sort of discipline everyone must endure during his first few years of life if he is to attain any personal competence at all.

The other compelling influence is the impact of the customs of society. This force will often dictate to the young baby such intimate and personal matters as when and how much to eat, when and how much to sleep, and when to eliminate, as well as when and how to conform to the more complicated techniques included in civilized behavior.

It is not ordinarily understood how compelling this latter force has become, particularly when backed up by medical instructions. Because physicians can point with pride to the fact that under optimal conditions and under their control the child mortality rate has been cut to a point where almost no well-born infants die, their advice has become heavily weighted with authority. Unfortunately their "training" advice has been unbelievably concentrated in the direc-

tion of rigid routines. We find, then, the babies squirming on the horns of a dilemma: on the one hand, driven by their own native developmental trends, and on the other, restricted by the authoritative routines of a scientific age. The effect of this situation has been to set up inevitable conflicts which will be illustrated later on. The point for us to remember at the outset is that it is not the baby's fault. He did not ask to be born with his own particular propensities nor did he ask to have these techniques inflicted upon him.

The obvious solution of such a problem in lack of synchrony is to make adjustments somewhere along the line. Up to the present time it has been very difficult to make cultural adjustments because it is characteristic of adults to feel that, when their children are concerned, "mother is always right." The result has been that we have expected the babies to make all of the adjustments. I submit that they have done a very creditable job in doing so. In fact, when it is thoughtfully considered, this remarkable ability of human babies to adjust to a difficult environment is the factor which has made civilized living possible, if, indeed, one may claim "civilized existence" in 1941.

We will approach this discussion of the difficulties encountered in feeding babies with the idea that the child is neither good nor bad but just *is*—just as he was made by his heredity. It is not fair to pass judgment on his acts without considering all of the evidence. Pediatricians, as his friends and advisers, should be the first to realize the situation. Apparently nobody else does.

Why is it that a baby often refuses to nurse even when his mother's breasts swell with milk? Why is it that he is likely to refuse cereal no matter in what sort of china it is served? Why does he pick, dally and fuss over his food and make us concede ridiculously in spite of the fact that the urge to eat is fundamental? Let us investigate the interplay of the two great forces we have described as they affect a child's ability to become a competent eater and see

what can be done to resolve the impasse we are facing.

The Baby's Own Equipment

To begin with, at the time he is born, the normal child is equipped with several adequate reflexes, or behavior patterns, which are designed to make him a successful feeder from the breast. The most obvious of these reflexes are those concerned with the actual getting of food—rooting, sucking, swallowing and satiety reflexes.

The *rooting* reflex is the first one of these to come into play. When a baby smells milk, he moves his head around and attempts to find its source. If one cheek is touched by a smooth object, he will turn his mouth toward that object and open it in anticipation of grasping the nipple. This obviously gives us a clue as to how milk should be applied to the baby. His cheek applied to his mother's breast will find him rooting with his mouth for the nipple.

I can illustrate a mistake made in this regard by telling the recent experience of a patient in one of our best hospitals. As I was making daily rounds she said to me, "Your nurses don't know their stuff!" In answer to my surprised inquiry as to what she meant she said: "They don't know anything about the rooting reflex. They bring my baby in, place her beside me, and with their hand on the baby's cheek try to push her head around to meet the nipple. The baby, feeling the pressure of the hand, tries to turn toward the nurse's palm instead of toward my breast. A fight ensues and usually the natural response is prevented. I always tell the girls to go out of the room; that I can handle this myself if they will just lay the baby down beside me. I touch her cheek with my breast and let her do the rest." This experienced mother had learned to respect her baby's ability in these basic matters. This is a highly important lesson for anybody to learn.

The *sucking* reflex, of course, is called out as soon as the baby grasps the nipple. This enables him to draw milk into the back part of the throat from where it is routed down to the stomach by the highly complicated *swallowing* mechanism. This involves the safe transport of milk past the opening to the lungs and down the gullet into the stomach. This ability is next only to the ability to breathe in safeguarding a child's life, because if milk is aspirated into the lungs, a very dangerous condition may result, leading to pneumonia and sometimes to death.

Baby's Ability to Know How Much Food He Needs

The other factor in his nursing equipment which makes him efficient as a feeder is his ability to know

whether or not he has had enough. One might call this the *satiety* mechanism. Many people might even challenge the existence of such a mechanism, since its workings are entirely unknown, but it must be quite obvious to anyone familiar with the growth and development of babies that unless such an accomplishment had grown up throughout the evolutionary period the race could never have survived. Something must have told prehistoric babies when to go and when to stop in eating.

Closely allied to this latter ability is the *hunger-appetite sequence* which exerts itself to tell a child not only when to stop and go in his meals but also how to select the foods he eats.

The mechanism of the hunger phase of this sequence is well recognized and understood because hunger can be physiologically demonstrated. The sensation we call hunger is caused by vigorous contractions of the stomach wall which occur rhythmically throughout the day. That these vigorous contractions actually cause pain has been demonstrated several times experimentally by means of a rubber balloon which the baby can swallow into his stomach. When partially inflated, this balloon can be made to register gastric movements on a drum, demonstrating their synchrony with his hunger cries. This sensation of hunger is probably the first unpleasant feeling that most babies get after they are born and placed in their warm cribs. One of the attributes of hunger is that the instant any form of nutriment touches the stomach wall, the cramps immediately cease.

In this faculty we can see the beginnings of the second phase of the sequence, appetite, because the relief from pain which results from swallowing gives the baby a pleasant response to food. This relief is experienced over and over again for days, weeks and months. Thus every baby comes to associate comfort with eating, and as he learns that different sorts of foods give him the same old comfort, the whole eating mechanism becomes enjoyable to him. It is believed that appetite really is a much more complex function of the body than just this pleasurable or comfortable response, because recent evidence has made it clear to us that through his appetite a child is able to select and choose the amounts and kinds of food which are needed for his growth. Here again we are at a loss to explain the exact way that this comes about.

All of these things we have just mentioned are born into each baby as part of his inherent ability. To these are added, however, many other factors which are brought about by his growth. We find that, dur-

ing his first few months, the baby gradually steps up the amount of milk he takes from the bottle, and later on does the same from the spoon and cup. Still later, between the second and fourth years of life, most children find it natural to cut down the number of calories they ingest, and we find the typical run-about child eating from one-half to two-thirds as much food as is taken by his year-old brother. Obviously it is the reduced speed of his growth which calls for this rather radical reduction in the amount of food taken. Again, during the preadolescent period, without any outside instruction, we find children gradually stepping up their appetite until they reach the rapidly growing spurt of adolescence and consume unbelievable amounts in this process. Finally, from this period on, there is a gradual falling off of appetite until again, in old age, a very small amount is found necessary.

Organic Mechanisms Serve Eating Efficiency

Further eating efficiency is due to the reflex which makes it possible for a child to carry food from the front of his mouth to the back of his throat. When solid food or a spoon is applied to the lips of a newly born baby, it is invariably thrust out by his protecting tongue, which makes it next to impossible to feed him in this manner. The only way a newly born baby can get food by this method is by placing him on his back with the mouth held open so that gravity carried the nourishment into his pharynx. After that, the swallowing reflex takes control and food goes into his stomach. Between the age of three and four months, however, practically all babies make a decided change in their mouth behavior. When food approaches the lips, they open and the tongue actively takes the nourishment back so that swallowing is easy. This obviously marks the time when children are equipped to take thick foods.

Soon after the six-months period, whether or not teeth have erupted, one finds babies making chewing motions with their jaws. This activity gives us a clue to the time when lumpy or solid particles may be given, because only after this time can they be masticated into suitable size for swallowing.

All of the time these changes have been going on, a neuromuscular coordination of the arms and hands has been developing so that the baby first grasps and holds his bottle with the hands, next learns to hold a cup, and finally learns to manipulate our sophisticated eating implements, such as the spoon, fork and knife. The changes in methods of feeding which go with this growth of muscular ability also indicate the time at which babies can take over more and more

of the feeding themselves. At four or five months they begin to be able to hold their own bottles; from six to nine months they can do something in the way of cup feeding; and by eighteen months they can do a fair job of self-feeding with a spoon. After these abilities have been consummated, adult attendance is unnecessary at meals. In fact, most children do much better if they are left alone to their own devices.

Babies Have a Dependable Rhythm

We have just outlined the ancient forces in the baby which enable him to become a successful feeder. How does the hunger-appetite mechanism fare today in our average hospital? It is quite evident to anyone that the baby's rhythmic hunger pains are completely ignored in his schedule for feeding. The newly born baby wakes up with a stomachache and announces his epigastric crisis by shrieking cries. Instead of being picked up and given something to eat, as nature intended for him, he is made to wait until the clock on the wall moves around to the approved hour, at which time, sleeping or screaming, he is picked up and fed. This rigidity of management, no matter how helpful it may be for the smooth running of the hospital, blocks the baby's eating ability in two or three ways. In the first place, unless he is under the influence of hunger pains, his first few feedings will not give him the grateful relief from distress which he was intended to experience. In the second place, when a sleeping baby is awakened to nurse at the breast by some of the methods commonly used in our hospitals, spanking, dashing with cold water, snapping his feet and hands, etc., he comes away with an unpleasant, rather than a pleasant, response to the whole eating complex. The next meal is, therefore, likely to meet with a more antagonistic response from him. This inconsiderate handling of the first few meals of life is the only adequate cause I know for anorexia nervosa congenita. I have never seen such lack of appetite in a newly born baby who was allowed to eat when he began to cry with hunger pains.

Another common factor which interferes with a young baby's eating is the increasing use of sedatives given to the mother before delivery, which gives rise to a certain amount of dopiness in the babies. This artificial languor seems to dull their early responses so that they do not care to eat, sometimes for as long as three or four days. If this factor is recognized and the babies are allowed to become thoroughly awake before attempting to nurse, their feeding abilities emerge in due time.

Another way in which our scientific methods inter-

fere with a baby's early feeding is in the rigid application of rules about the length of time he may nurse, or about the amount of food put into his supplementary bottles. If a child has taken his fill at the breast, no amount of pushing or hauling will be successful in making him take more food. The forcing disgusts him with the whole unpleasant process. It is just as important, on the other hand, to allow him to nurse as long as he desires so that he will come away from his feeding completely satisfied. This is as true with bottle feeding as it is with breast feeding. For fifteen years I have never restricted any baby in the amount of food he took from breast or bottle, and I have never seen a newly born baby who would overeat when so handled. Unless his satiety mechanism is allowed to mature, he cannot become a successful feeder.

Under the régime practised in most hospitals, babies are denied the satisfaction of the two o'clock feeding in the morning, in spite of the fact that practically all babies awaken in the early morning hours and demand with shrieks and wails to have their stomachs filled. The argument in favor of this restriction is that the babies will sleep through the night if you break them of this habit. As a matter of fact, I have never seen a baby who would awaken for a 2:00 A.M. feeding after he was six weeks old if the feedings were offered him whenever he cried at night. It is a part of their growth and development that they eliminate this early morning feeding before that time. In the interest of satisfactory meals and the comfort of babies during their early days, it seems reasonable to allow them this nourishment until their own development marks the time for its discontinuance. The same observation holds for the 10:00 P.M. feeding, which is given up voluntarily by babies after they are a few months old. The proper time for the elimination of these night feedings is when babies stop asking for them.

To the casual observer, what has just been said about allowing babies freedom of choice in their meal times may seem to advocate an irregular régime for children, and this would be quite true were it not for the fact that the average baby is at least as regular as the kitchen clock. In his own body resides the rhythmic mechanism which awakens him for meals at approximately the same moment day in and day out. Each baby has his own individual time interval, which remains approximately the same over long periods of time, and can be safely relied upon to indicate his nursing needs. However, as a practical point, the baby's own demands need not be too rigidly adhered to after the first two or three days

of life because he is a very accommodating sort of person. After the first few meals are given to him and he becomes accustomed to the relief from pain which follows, he will usually be glad to eat at any time the food is offered to him. This is why most babies can be adjusted to a four-hour régime. The ones that cannot be held over to this schedule are usually very happy on a three-hour routine.

As the baby grows older we should see to it that when he shows the ability and desire to hold his bottle, manipulate the cup and feed himself with a spoon, he is given the opportunity to learn these new techniques. If he is denied the opportunity when he first shows the desire, because it makes for messy feedings, he may become fixed in baby ways of eating and may not respond to more mature behavior when the family thinks he should. Similarly it is futile to attempt spoon feedings until the baby's tongue activity shows that he has reached this maturation point. If an attempt is made earlier to force semi-solids down his throat, he is likely to be frightened or irritated, and to obstruct rather than to help in his feeding program.

When the baby's jaws begin to chew is the obvious time to introduce lumpy sorts of food. If this is done, the baby takes the food naturally and becomes a good "chewer." On the other hand, if the cue is missed, he is likely again to be fixed at an infantile level and to continue to demand sieved foods long after the time his own inclinations would lead him to masticate.

Appetite is Gauge of Need

The increase and decrease in the appetite urge of children is often ignored completely, and this ignoring of the normal decrease which occurs in the run-about child results in undue urging of food, and is one of the commonest causes for the prevalent run-about anorexia. If every mother could realize that her three- or four-year-old child should eat about two-thirds as much as he did when he was a year old, we would not see so much forcing of food at this time.

Another developmental trait which occurs in relation to nap time at about one year of age leads to a great deal of confusion as to the proper time to introduce the baby to a three-meal schedule. At this time it is customary to feed children at seven and ten in the morning and two and six in the afternoon. The baby at this same time does a peculiar thing in connection with his sleep habits. He gives up his afternoon nap and clings to his late morning nap when one would expect him to be "raring to go"

(Continued on page 11)

Report Adopted March 18, 1942, by the Children's Bureau, Commission on Children in Wartime

A Children's Charter in Wartime

WE are in total war against the aggressor nations. We are fighting again for human freedom and especially for the future of our children in a free world.

CHILDREN must be safeguarded—and they can be safeguarded—in the midst of this total war so that they can live and share in that future. They must be nourished, sheltered, and protected even in the stress of war production so that they will be strong to carry forward a just and lasting peace.

OUR American Republics sprang from a sturdy yearning for tolerance, independence, and self-government. The American home has emerged from the search for freedom. Within it the child lives and learns through his own efforts the meaning and responsibilities of freedom.

WE have faith in the children of the New World—faith that if our generation does its part now, they will renew the living principles in our common life, and make the most of them.

BOTH as a wartime responsibility and as stepping-stones to our future—and to theirs—we call upon citizens, young and old, to join together to—

- I. Guard children from injury in danger zones.
- II. Protect children from neglect, exploitation, and undue strain in defense areas.
- III. Strengthen the home life of children whose parents are mobilized for war or war production.
- IV. Conserve, equip, and free children of every race and creed to take their part in democracy.

Notes on National Conference

The headquarters of the Child Welfare League of America at the National Conference will be in the Hotel St. Charles, New Orleans.

The League's program is under the chairmanship of Mr. Jerome N. Sampson, Secretary for Case Work Service, Social Planning Council of St. Louis. A copy of the program is enclosed with this Bulletin to League members and affiliates. Copies will be available at the League's booth.

Consultation service in the various fields of child welfare will be available during the Conference week. Requests for appointments should be made at the League's booth as early in the week as possible.

Exhibits at the National Conference

The 1942 Case Record Exhibit of the Child Welfare League will be presented at the National Conference. One hundred and fifty records covering variety of case work with parents and children by agencies offering services and foster family care and institutions and own homes. The subjects include intake, placement, transfers and discharge, adoption, homemaker service, juvenile court cases, work with refugees, and direct therapy in child guidance clinics and in case work agency.

The League is also exhibiting the scrapbook prepared by the staff of the Milwaukee Orphans' Asylum, entitled "The Program of a Children's Institution," which describes and illustrates the case work and activities program from intake through discharge. A "Scrapbook on Foster Parent Education," prepared by the Ohio Committee on Child Placing, will also be available.

BULLETIN

Published monthly (omitted in July and August) as the official organ of the Child Welfare League of America.

Henrietta L. Gordon, *Editor*

The Bulletin is in large measure a Forum for discussion in print of child welfare problems. Endorsement does not necessarily go with the printing of opinions expressed over a signature.

Annual subscription, \$1.00

Single copies, 10c.

Checks payable to Child Welfare League of America, Inc.

"Strengthening Medicine"

CHILD welfare workers need a spring tonic, even as did Roo, the son of Kanga, in A. A. Milne's book, *Winnie-the Pooh*. The tonic, as prescribed by the Child Welfare League of America, is the *Child Care Supplement* to the April issue of the League's monthly BULLETIN.

There has been much recent talk at the League's regional conferences in St. Paul, Cleveland, and Providence, to the effect that it is a patriotic and professional duty to improve our daily work. Evidence of this improvement is to be desired, and the *Child Care Supplement* offers such evidence in generous measure.

It is from our own regional conferences that some of these articles have been gathered. The principal functions of the League's member agencies have been kept in mind, and Mrs. Henrietta L. Gordon, editor of the BULLETIN, has crowded into the *Supplement's* pages articles of value to homefinders, protective workers, institution personnel, county workers who are holding the front lines in Child Welfare Services.

It is significant that within the space of one month the staff of the League has been in touch with official representatives of three national church bureaus, the National Congress of Parents and Teachers, the National Child Welfare Division of the American Legion, the Congress of the Women's Auxiliary of the C.I.O., and the Association of Junior Leagues of America.

Here is a background of popular leadership which will support local agencies in projects which are vital. Stimulation from such leadership should be translated into community planning and professional study.

The League always has served citizen groups, especially those organized by churches and fraternal orders. Many consultations and many of our surveys have been requested by such groups. The range of these relationships being extended, we can expect to carry farther than ever before our influence for im-

proving children's work under such auspices. Of still greater importance is the influence of these constituencies in community planning through local councils of social agencies and, on a larger scale, for states, regions and the nation.

Literature on child welfare seldom recognizes sectarian or political alignments. This is true of the League, which has in its membership Catholic, Jewish, Protestant, non-sectarian, and governmental agencies. This is an American way, and we propose to follow it in all efforts toward enlisting those interested in the improvement of children's work. As such groups come into the picture locally, our members must be strong indeed to provide the professional leadership such groups will need.

We are appraising literally the expressions of zeal which accompany much of the conscientious recognition of war-time needs of children. It is clear that, as never before, our country desires *all* its children to be well fed and otherwise healthy, and that in our humblest homes there be enrichment of the understanding and care of each boy and girl, and of the tiniest baby. It is a sign of the times that a group of child guidance workers, including some of our eminent psychiatrists, have collaborated in preparing a government publication entitled, *To Parents in War Time*, which has just been released by the U. S. Children's Bureau.

In addition to our usual publications and the April *Child Care Supplement* we will, at the National Conference of Social Work in New Orleans, have a second edition of the League's case record exhibit. The exhibit, used as many have used the League's initial case record assembled in 1941, will strengthen the work of an agency and develop fitness in individual workers.

The *Child Care Supplement* is a trial effort, and we do not promise to have another such extension of our regular BULLETIN. In fact, it is sufficiently costly to require some economy in its distribution. It will go to the office of each accredited member agency, each affiliate and associate, as well as to all paying subscribers to the BULLETIN and our new constituency of individual contributing members. But to the hundreds of trustees of member agencies who are on the BULLETIN's free list the *Supplement* will be mailed only upon receipt of the request coupon which is enclosed with their copies of the BULLETIN.

The *Supplement* is planned primarily for professional workers. It is an encouraging trend, however, to find many trustees becoming familiar with professional child welfare literature. The "strengthening medicine" in Mr. Milne's story once slipped by mis-

take down the throat of a curious and experimenting creature, Tigger, instead of nourishing the tiny Roo, for whom it was meant. Tigger liked it and kept on taking it as a part of his regular diet. So we will encourage board members to ask for our "strengthening medicine," which has been prepared especially as a tonic for workers.

—HOWARD W. HOPKIRK

NEWS FROM THE FIELD

The Children's Aid Society of New York City Reports on its Housekeeper Service

The number of motherless families referred for Housekeeper Service has increased. There is a keener realization of family solidarity, and a real effort to keep children in their own home with an adequate father.

Home life seems to have more meaning as the world about us becomes more chaotic. We feel that there has been no other reason than this to account for the increase in applications for our service at this time.

The bulk of our families continue to be the marginal income group, not on relief; the fathers are steady workers, but now are fearful of losing their jobs due to priorities. There have been a few isolated instances of defense work in Greater New York. There has also been an indication of a possible trend of mothers—not employed for years—returning to positions as nurses' aides, office and store workers. Their children go to school and day nurseries, but when illness strikes, a housekeeper is needed temporarily to care for the children at home. If the condition increases, it will be necessary to have a well-coordinated community day care program set up between the day nursery schools and Housekeeper Service.

The family agencies and the various departments of New York City Welfare program have increased their direct applications for Housekeeper Service, and have been prepared to contribute financially for the service when it would otherwise have been withheld due to budget restrictions. This opens up the question of charging a fee for the service unless our agency can underwrite an enlarged community program for Housekeeper Service.

During the first three months of 1942 there have been 305 families with 1159 children referred for Housekeeper Service. This shows a steady upward trend when compared with the 189 families who applied during the first quarter of the previous year.

In these three months we have placed housekeepers

in 57 families and cared for 210 children. The adults of these families number 104, so that our housekeepers gave service to 210 children and 104 adults.

The bulk of applications for service has continued to be for a mother substitute to care for the children during the temporary absence for illness of the mother.

More recently there have been applications for housekeepers from young women with young babies whose husbands have been drafted. These women must work to maintain themselves and their children. Foster home placement is crowded and cannot give immediate placement service, and, in most cases, the mothers do not wish placement. They can pay in whole or in part for Housekeeper Service, but need a supervised housekeeper because the nature of their work and the needs of their children demand a carefully placed and supervised woman in the home. The cost of this care is worth noting:

1. Average weekly cost per family (\$23,622 divided by 901.6 weeks) \$26.20
2. Average housekeeper wages per week per family (\$15,706 divided by 901.6 weeks) . . . 17.42
3. Average cost per week per child (\$26.20 divided by 3.7 children) 7.08
4. Average housekeeper wages per week per child (\$17.42 divided by 3.7 children) 4.71
5. Average cost per day per child (\$7.08 divided by 6 days) 1.18
6. Average housekeeper wages per day per child (\$4.71 divided by 6 days)78

We have endeavored to give consultation service and advice to these mothers, but have not supplied them with our own housekeepers. If these applications increase, we shall have to either consider a caseload of pay cases or have Foster Home Intake accommodate these mothers.

—MADELEINE VH. MANGINELLI

Director of Housekeeper Service

Florence Poole: "The Child and the Social Case Worker in the Public Schools," *Social Case Work in Public Schools*, Oct., 1941, p. 34. (Published by American Association of Visiting Teachers.) A discussion of case work in an agency not organized for case work, where the client has not asked for case work service.

Marian McBee: "A Function for the Psychiatric Social Worker in the National Defense Program," *News Letter, American Association of Psychiatric Social Workers*, Autumn, 1941, p. 12. A summary of a panel discussion, with descriptions of the experience of the psychiatric social worker with Selective Service in New York City.

John Otto Reinemann, LL.D.: "Forty Years of the Juvenile Court Movement in the United States," *Mental Hygiene*, April, 1941, p. 256. A review of the underlying philosophy of the Juvenile Court and the relationship between law and social work in the treatment of Juvenile delinquency.

THE BOARD MEMBER SPEAKS—

TRUSTEESHIP IN WARTIME

Board members, like social workers, find their work more complicated and confusing than it was in April, 1941. It is well to identify as many as possible of the factors causing this confusion, and to face squarely all that makes it difficult to gear the child welfare services of the country to both the present and the developing needs of our children.

He who is on the governing boards of several agencies has an opportunity for obtaining a perspective so greatly needed. He may find himself overworked by the increasing demands of these agencies, but it is important that he recognize this opportunity.

It is necessary to think, as never before, in terms of the entire community. And in these days the community's boundaries are not easy to determine. Your community may be overflowing with workers and families from a hundred other communities. This situation probably means more relations of your agency with those in other states. Increasingly our cities and counties will be coping with the problems of families well known to them whose husbands and fathers are in distant places in military service or industrial war work. Families or individuals may arrive from Hawaii or Alaska, just as before the war reached our own country, children came from Europe bringing to many communities new and perplexing problems. Enemy aliens need as much consideration as we expect the Japanese to show to Americans who are under their custody.

The war having brought some of these problems, and the proportions of the problems in some communities being so great as to swamp local facilities, there is definite need for federal subsidy in many services. Many Americans have a healthy reluctance to participate in any effort to obtain or administer federal funds for work which traditionally has been the responsibility of local government or of private enterprise. We need an awareness of the hazards to our country's resources as we utilize federal funds, but the necessity for large federal appropriations for certain types of local child welfare work is obvious. The war cannot be fought on a county or state level; and just as we need a mixture of the citizen's contribution and our national financial resources in maintaining an outpost in the Pacific, so we need a similar combination to safeguard the welfare of children in those hamlets which have become cities overnight, cities created for the building of ships, planes and explosives. We need to remember that in a very real sense every farm and every family home in the country

has a part to play, and that we must not forget the child in the most remote rural neighborhood, whose burdens will indeed be heavy after the war.

We will be lacking in spirit if we fail to sustain the quality of our ordinary services. This will not be easy, with prices at present levels and with some of our most capable personnel drawn into other activities. Participation in nation-wide planning for the recruiting and training of more social workers is one of the Child Welfare League's foremost obligations. This problem brings the local agency and community, as never before, into a dependence upon educational programs, often centered in distant cities. Social work being a young profession, we still have many workers without qualifications consistent with their duties. Any ground lost in our efforts to staff children's agencies with competent workers will be hard to regain.

Responsibilities of board members which assume proportions larger than in peace time pertain also to: (1) validity of the agency's functions; (2) the ability of the agency to account in terms of good service for all of its functions; (3) the relations of the agency with other agencies, and particularly with governmental agencies, and (4) the adaptability of the entire child welfare program of the community, including the program of the particular agency, to those needs of children created or intensified by the war.

In all this we must keep stretching the boundaries of the community beyond the city to the county, to the state and to the nation. After the war we may need to stretch the boundaries still farther.

—LEONARD W. MAYO

President, Board of Directors, Child Welfare League of America

A Glimpse at the League's Regional Conferences

ABOUT a year ago the Regional Conference Committee of the Child Welfare League's Board held an all-day meeting, attended by the temporary and regular staff, to discuss ways and means to encourage and promote effective regional conferences. In keeping with the policy of our executive and board that the activities of the membership be increasingly regional, and actively include interests of executive, staff and board, there were suggestions as to program as well as institutes. Over one hundred child welfare workers from all parts of the country are serving on committees organizing and administering these conferences. The six regional conferences held this year had an attendance larger in number and greater in

enthusiasm than ever before. Institutes for case workers and supervisors were unusually well attended. Round table discussions afforded increased opportunities for wide staff participation.

The interest in the problems of child welfare ran high and was equalled only by a keen concern with the state of our nation. A few of the high lights are here reviewed.

The responsibilities of social workers in general and child welfare workers in particular to further national unity for the successful prosecution of the war was thoughtfully considered. It was recognized that the exigencies of war make demands on human beings which tend to intensify and multiply the difficulties that have beset portions of our people all through the years, that the security, the protection, the morale of families, are so essential to a successful war effort as to make this a major and fundamental contribution. With the awareness of the great importance of protecting children from undue physical and emotional strain and the important part that stable family life plays in making the values of life we are fighting to preserve a reality, the conferences reiterated their determination to improve, sustain and develop services to families and children.

Especially intensified difficulties in defense areas, the need for a program of day care for the children of working mothers, the needs of migratory families who suffer from inadequate housing and poor schooling, came in for some special attention. For example, at one of the regionals it was pointed out that:

"Acute housing shortage, trailer camps, lack of sanitary facilities, lack of day care facilities, increased delinquency, increased illegitimacy, increased child labor, are the problems that exist in approximately one thousand defense areas spread through every state in the union."

From another area it was reported that:

"The program of child welfare services also has been strengthened in relation to children who are in danger of becoming delinquent. Our public welfare law provides that there shall be a closely integrated and cooperative relationship between our Juvenile Courts and our county departments of public assistance. Therefore, there has been a decline in the number of commitments to the four industrial schools of the state. Through preventive measures on the part of child welfare workers, fewer children actually appear in courts of juvenile delinquency."

In addition:

"... there have been several important changes in our child welfare laws. The maximum age of children coming under the control of courts of juvenile jurisdiction was raised to eighteen years; the adoption law was changed to provide for a year's waiting period, and to enable our department to make social investigations to the courts; special boarding homes are provided by county departments for children pending court action."

These are encouraging signs, but we were cautioned by several speakers not to be lulled into complacency by these only too sporadic efforts at meeting the

increasing necessity for a strengthened supporting program of social services. As one speaker put it:

"Despite the relatively high degree of awareness, on the part of the citizenry and government, of the importance of meeting social problems in our civilian defense program, there is still apparent a tragic and dangerous lag between the development of industrial and military programs and provisions for the health and welfare of the workers and 'service' population of our defense areas.

"The problems of protection, service, and care of children in defense areas are basically the same problems with which we were concerned prior to the present emergency. They vary with the following factors:

- (a) The rate of population increase
- (b) Character of the defense activity
- (c) The volume of employment of women and children
- (d) The relative maturity (or primitiveness) of health and welfare programs established prior to the present emergency.

"We must anticipate problems before they arise and plan to meet them in an orderly, consistent manner. In only this way can we make our proper contribution to the national need for maximum efficiency and maximum productivity of all of our human resources."

The difficulties in finding sufficient and adequate foster homes were another subject that claimed the attention of several of the regional conferences. In one regional a committee had spent some weeks in advance discussing this subject. They arrived at these conclusions, that agencies need to review their home finding methods, that they need to develop more effective publicity methods, and that the board rate may have to be revised in terms of the increased cost of living. During the course of discussion, serious thought was given to what has been considered as "objective criteria of a good foster home." Some questioned how rigidly we can hold to concepts such as, "childless couples can only be parents to children free for adoption or really permanent care"; "homes of widows should not be used for boys or for long time care"; or "children should have a room to themselves." It was agreed that a more realistic approach is in order. Foster children should be offered only such homes as are available. Case workers need to be aware of the child's need but must also face and help the child face his part in making a foster home experience satisfying.

Increased public services to children in rural areas, and in areas of expanded war effort, were seen as a growing necessity. More effective utilization of volunteer services and the urgent necessity of an in-service training program for both the volunteer and the professional staffs were seen as one answer to the serious problem of staff shortage.

This has been a fruitful year. It served to confirm the feeling that in times of stress for client and worker, we need more than ever an opportunity to interchange experiences.

—HENRIETTA L. GORDON

Psychiatric Social Work in a Reception Area*

ELINOR SINNOTT

Previously Psychiatric Social Worker, West Riding Reception Area

"IT'S like being thrown overboard," a boy of twelve said this to me when he was talking about how it felt to be evacuated. His remark sums up what many evacuated children must have felt, at some moments at least. Evacuation has taught us many things about children, and about grown-ups, too; it has underlined many things for us which we already knew. One of these things is that deep need of every child to feel himself wanted and welcomed by someone. It is this feeling of being wanted which provides that sense of security upon which so much of a child's happiness depends.

Working in the reception areas we have seen so many times the child who lacks this security and affection from some adult. We have seen how this lack affects every side of his life. A child who feels unwanted may behave in many different ways. He may be hostile and aggressive, boasting, or impudent and unapproachable. He may take on a pose of a "tough guy." He may have such fear and resentment against the world that he will "get in his knock first" at everyone, and make himself heartily disliked in consequence. Lack of confidence in making friends or tackling a job of work, sensitiveness to real or imagined failure, may make a child retiring, mopey, and filled with the feeling that he is no good at anything nor ever will be. Imaginary tales of adventures and exploits may bring disapproval and punishments from grown-ups who call them "lies"—yet it is in these imaginary adventures that a child may be getting that feeling of achievement and recognition which he lacks in real life.

Leaving home to go to complete strangers means that every child evacuated has had, all of a sudden, to adapt himself to different standards, speech, and ways of life. A child who is secure and happy at the outset probably manages very well, provided, too, he meets with friendliness and good sense in his foster home.

Difficult Behavior is a Symptom

Maybe things are otherwise. Suppose a child has been spoilt, over-dependent upon mother, always "cock of the walk" at home—how will he behave

when he is thrust into strange, new circumstances so ill-prepared? Suppose he has always been "odd man out" at home, the one who always came in for all the blame and scolding, the one of the family of whom Mum is not unwilling to be relieved. Such a child will have little confidence with which to meet the new home and faces at the unknown other end of the railway journey. Maybe he feels inside him that evacuation is just a way of mothers getting rid of naughty boys. This feeling gets worse, especially if Mum doesn't write or send any parcels. Perhaps he finds a real welcome and a home which becomes more truly his than the one which he has left. It is after the war and not now that this particular problem will have to be faced.

Parents' Payments for the Care of Their Children

INCREASE in payment by parents for children in foster care is being reported in various parts of the country. This is not particularly for children being placed now because both of their parents are finding jobs. It refers to situations where the children have been in care for a considerable period of time, and where the parents are paying more regularly than ever before. One large Eastern city reported an increase in collections of over \$50,000 this past year.

There is some speculation as to how much this increase in amounts collected is due to increased employment and how much to a change in the case worker's approach to this question. Traditionally, workers in the child care field had considered themselves free from the necessity to have "money dealings" with their clients. They rather relished this difference from the responsibility of case workers in the family field, both public and private.

It now appears that the case workers' growing awareness that the parent's attitude about paying toward the care of his child, to the extent of his ability, is an expression of his wish to be responsible for rearing his child and, together with other factors, may be a measure of his ability to do something about that wish.

We know that words may be used to cover up feeling as often as to express it, and similarly payment may cover up rejection of parental responsibility as it may express acceptance of that obligation. In our search for ways of helping a parent recognize and act on his real feelings toward his children, we may learn to accord "money dealings" their rightful dignity.

—H. L. G.

* Excerpt from *Mother and Child*, March, 1942.

Day Care of Children

The establishment or expansion of day care centers, day nursery schools, and the development or expansion of other appropriate programs are now part of the day care program of the Community Facilities Act. Application for these facilities and for their operation can be filed by the appropriate local authorities. The U. S. Children's Bureau will certify local applications only after they have been approved by the state welfare department. The regional child welfare consultants of the U. S. Children's Bureau and the specialists on school facilities of the Office of Education will be responsible for making technical recommendations to the Regional Director of Defense Health and Welfare Services, and to the heads of their respective agencies in connection with applications for facilities.

Ancient Processes in a Scientific Age: Feeding Aspects

(Continued from page 4)

after his all-night sleep. Most infants enjoy the ten o'clock bottle before this late morning nap. Suddenly, however, they give up this lifelong habit and decide to stay awake all morning and to sleep after their lunch. If a mother observes her child carefully, she will never miss this obvious shift, and this is the moment at which she will begin to feed him on a strictly three-meal schedule, with breakfast from seven to eight, dinner from eleven to twelve, and supper from five to six.

While none of these factors which we have just covered is of immediate life and death importance to the welfare of the baby, the sum total may indicate the degree of competency which he develops as an eater. When we remember that this substantial list of difficulties has to do only with the feeding of the baby, and that the same sort of influences are active in establishing his competency in sleeping, eliminating and other habit formations, it is easy to understand why the study of normal growth and development is important in the routine management of children. It is our duty to introduce the child to his habits in the world in such a way that he can accept them as natural and right. To control these factors, which are so tremendously important in the future life of our infants, is a great opportunity which we today should be glad to accept.

BOOK NOTES

TRAINING FOR SKILL IN SOCIAL CASE WORK. Edited by Virginia P. Robinson, Pennsylvania School of Social Work, University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia, 1942.

Publications of the Pennsylvania School of Social Work are anticipated and valued because they have consistently expressed dedication to the profession of social work, thoughtful consideration of principles involved in one area of its practice, and courageous statement of conviction in relation to that practice. *Training for Skill in Social Case Work* brings to the problem of the teaching of social case work the same quality of thought and clarity of statement that the three preceding volumes of the *Journal of Social Work Process* have brought to its practice.

The book consists of articles describing the separate aspects of the "practice unit" which constitutes the focus of the curriculum of the Pennsylvania School of Social Work. This practice unit consists of three inter-related elements—a class in social case work, a class in personality, and practice in a social agency. "In the fourth semester," writes Miss Robinson, in an introduction which describes the history and philosophy of the Pennsylvania School of Social Work, "the practice class gives way to a thesis assignment in which the student works individually with the help of an adviser to integrate and organize in a formal statement what he has learned to understand and to do in his training experience."

Miss Robinson's own article, "The Meaning of Skill," makes a challenging statement about the nature of the skill which the school takes the responsibility for developing, describing it as involving, in common with all skills, "an understanding of the material to be worked with and a capacity to work with rather than against it—to utilize rather than to do violence to its essential nature,"—a concept which has far-reaching implications for the teaching and practice of social case work which have only begun to be understood. The Pennsylvania School's program has grown out of faculty conviction that practice rather than knowledge content determines the focus in curriculum building in a school of social work, and faculty belief that skill growing out of practice, in order to achieve professional status, must have a generic base underlying its expression in specific situations. "Our search for this generic base," writes Miss Robinson, "has led us to define and abstract a process of relationship which we have called the helping process."

Articles subsequent to Miss Robinson's, by members of the case work faculty and two field supervisors of the Pennsylvania School, describe the vari-

ous parts of the practice unit: "Class Room and Field Work: Their Joint Contribution to Skill," by Goldie Basch; "The Function of the Personality Course in the Practice Unit," by Dr. Jessie Taft; and "The Supervision of Field Work," two articles, one by Faith Clark, dealing with the supervision of the first-year student, and one by Madeline Maris, with the supervision of the second-year student.

The two final articles, previously published and here reprinted, one by Dr. Taft on "The Relation of Function to Process," and one by Kenneth Pray on, "The Agency's Rôle in Service," clarify certain concepts essential to an understanding of skill as described in this volume.

The significance of *Training for Skill in Social Case Work* lies not only in its contribution to professional education for social work, to which it brings a dynamic and integrated point of view, but in its implications for the practice of social case work as well. The field teaching described took place in children's agencies (in school counselling and child placing), but the principles involved are equally applicable to any setting.

This reviewer's wish would be that the content of other classes and their integration into the total curriculum (a project outside the scope of this book) would some time be described. Not only must the total curriculum of a school of social work be oriented to practice, but each field of practice must be seen in relation to the total profession, and the curriculum concern itself with what is generic to all of social work as well as with what is generic for any one field of practice.

One carries away from this volume the conviction that teaching in this school of social work, through the nature of the experience it offers, truly "enables" the student to learn, to his fullest capacity, a kind of social case work practice which reflects the same qualities of consideration and respect for the client which he has experienced as a student.

—RUTH SMALLEY

Associate Professor of Social Case Work, University of Pittsburgh

TO PARENTS IN WARTIME. U. S. Children's Bureau Publication No. 282. Price, 5 cents.

A twenty-page pamphlet prepared by five outstanding leaders in the field of psychiatry, social work and education. It develops the thesis that "your children can take it if you can," therefore parents must prepare themselves to take it. Dangers there must and will be, and children will sense them. Parents are therefore advised to face the situation

squarely with the children, and to utilize the resulting increased desire to do something about the situation for some genuinely, useful activity. In very simple language, this pamphlet discusses how to treat with the very young child, the school child and the adolescent. Here is an appreciation of the difficult task ahead and a realistic guide for parents and foster parents.

—H. L. GORDON

Available on Loan to Members, Affiliates and Associates

A BRITISH SOCIAL WORKER LOOKS BACK, Margaret A. Thomas, *Public Welfare News*, March, 1942, and explains her conviction that social services must be maintained and added needs anticipated or "serious consequences in the welfare of the nation as a whole would ensue."

A STUDY OF SOME POORLY ADJUSTED FAMILIES, Raymond R. Willoughby, Rhode Island Department of Social Welfare, *American Sociological Review*, February, 1942.

THE PROBLEM OF THE PRE-SCHOOL CHILD: Treatment of the Young Child in a Child Guidance Clinic, Hyman S. Lippman; Direct Treatment of the Pre-School Child, Margaret W. Gerard; Treatment of the Young Child in the Hospital, Edith B. Jackson; Discussion, Beata Rank, *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, January, 1942.

DYNAMICS OF RÔLES AS DETERMINED IN THE STRUCTURE OF THE FAMILY, Dr. Frederick H. Allen, *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, January, 1942.

AMBIVALENCE AS A FACTOR IN HOME PLACEMENT FAILURE, George E. Gardner, *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, January, 1942.

ASPECTS OF PROCESS IN STUDENT SUPERVISION, William Posner, Case Work Notebook, *Social Work Today*, December, 1941.

THE RÔLE OF PARENTAL ATTITUDES IN THE TREATMENT OF DISEASES IN CHILDREN, Lee Yugend, *Mental Hygiene*, October, 1941.

THE PSYCHIATRIC ASPECTS OF CIVILIAN MORALE AS RELATED TO CHILDREN, Dr. D. A. Thom, *Mental Hygiene*, October, 1941.

THE Committee on Supervised Homemaker Service, composed mainly of representatives of the private family and children's agencies, has as its purpose to develop standards of service, to further the extension of homemaker service, and to encourage community planning for effective use of this service. The United States Children's Bureau, in cooperation with this committee, the Family Welfare Association of America and the Child Welfare League of America, has undertaken to act as a clearing house of information for this service. They have just published a Directory of Private Agencies having Programs of Supervised Homemaker Service, Agencies Providing Supervised Homemaker Service and Housekeeping-Aide Programs and List of References on Homemaker Service.

CHILD WELFARE LEAGUE OF AMERICA, INC.

130 EAST TWENTY-SECOND ST., NEW YORK, N. Y.

PRICE 25 CENTS

BULLETIN

APRIL, 1942

CHILD CARE AND PROTECTION SUPPLEMENT

Let no one whose daily job is concerned with safeguarding the health and welfare of children feel that he or she is not contributing to the war effort of the nation.

Our first aim in war must be to defeat the enemy, our next to save and protect our children. Every physician, every public health nurse, every medical-social worker, who helps to make maternity safe and childhood a period of health and growth, every child welfare worker who helps parents, teachers, judges, and recreation leaders to see that children are saved from neglect and delinquency, is giving a service which is supremely important in time of war.

—Katharine F. Lenroot

CONTENTS

	Page
A STAFF STUDIES ITS HOMES AND FACES ITS HOME FINDING PROBLEMS	3
<i>Sophie Camp</i>	
INTERPRETING CHILD WELFARE SERVICES TO THE COMMUNITY	8
<i>Mary S. King</i>	
THE FOCUS OF CASE WORK IN A CHILDREN'S INSTITUTION	12
<i>Maurice Bernstein</i>	
INSTITUTION AND FOSTER HOME CARE AS USED BY AN AGENCY OFFERING BOTH SERVICES	18
<i>Eva Burmeister</i>	
STOP AND GO SIGNS IN CHILD PROTECTION	24
<i>E. Marguerite Gane</i>	
THE AGENCY'S PART IN HELPING ADOLESCENTS TO ASSUME RESPONSIBILITY	27
<i>Madeleine Maris</i>	
THERAPY WITH PLACED CHILDREN	31
<i>Marian B. Nicholson</i>	
CASE WORK SERVICE IN A DAY NURSERY	35
<i>Dorothy Curtis Melby</i>	
CONSTRUCTIVE USE OF THE CHILDREN'S COURT	38
<i>Barbara C. Bryer</i>	

Why This Supplement

THIS year the BULLETIN has sought each month to bring to its readers an article on the practices in one of the various services encompassed in child care and protection. Interest in these articles has been mounting, and workers have shown a growing readiness to be articulate about their questions, problems and practices. Papers presented at Regional, State and National Conferences have been received with enthusiasm. At our invitation some workers have submitted papers in which they describe and discuss some particular experience where there has been more than general interest.

The League has been hard-pressed in the matter of making these contributions available because of the limited space of its BULLETIN. This Supplement is an experiment in extending the BULLETIN to present some of the discussions of principles, practices and processes in child care and protection.

—HENRIETTA L. GORDON
Editor of Publications,
Child Welfare League of America

Contributors to this Issue

Sophie Camp, Case Worker, Children's Aid Society of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa. The material for this paper was gathered by the staff of the Children's Aid Society of Pennsylvania, which studied its homes in an effort to solve some of their home finding problems.

Mary S. King, Case Worker, Licking County Child Welfare Services, Newark, Ohio.

Maurice Bernstein, Director, Pleasantville Cottage School, New York Association for Jewish Children, Pleasantville, N. Y. This paper was presented at the Ohio Valley Regional Conference of the Child Welfare League of America, March, 1942.

Eca Burmeister, Superintendent, Milwaukee Orphans' Asylum, Milwaukee, Wis.

E. Marguerite Gane, Executive Secretary, Children's Aid and S.P.C.C., Buffalo, N. Y. This paper was presented at the annual meeting of the Rhode Island S.P.C.C., January, 1942.

Madeleine Maris, Supervisor, Children's Bureau of Philadelphia. This paper was presented at National Conference, June, 1941.

Marian B. Nicholson, Philadelphia Child Guidance Clinic, Philadelphia, Pa. This paper was presented at National Conference, June, 1941.

Dorothy C. Melby, Family Service Department, Salvation Army, Baltimore, Md.

Barbara C. Bryer, Case Worker, Children's Aid and S.P.C.C., Buffalo, N. Y.

A Staff Studies Its Homes and Faces Its Home Finding Problems

SOPHIE CAMP

THE problem of how to find enough really good foster homes, or even those that are likely with help to develop into usable homes, is an ever-present one for any child placing agency. The Children's Aid Society of Pennsylvania, during the past few years, has become increasingly aware of the seriousness of this problem and how it limits our services for children. There are indications of this shortage in a number of different areas. In the first place the actual volume of families applying for children has been decreasing; there is just not a large or steady enough flow of people coming to the agency. Then out of the group that do apply there are not enough acceptable homes. In the period from January 1941 to January 1942, 326 individuals expressed some interest in considering foster children, but out of this number of inquiries we produced only 57 usable homes. A great many applications are not even accepted for study, being rejected or withdrawn before or after a first interview. But even with the number of actually studied homes sifted down to 165, it means that two homes had to be rejected for every one accepted. This elimination process is costly in many respects for the agency and it is troubling to find so little that is valuable coming forth from so much time and effort. Moreover, with fewer homes to use, and some of these none too well equipped to meet the inevitable ups and downs of most placements, it has meant that we have not had a sufficiently wide range of choice in selecting homes for individual children to meet their needs as we would like to be able to. As we know so well, from long experience, a child's placement may be strengthened greatly by the help a case worker can give him in his adjustment in a new home and by the support she can bring to the foster parents going through it with him. Nevertheless, the fact remains that our margin of success is definitely narrowed when perhaps we have to use the only available home we have at the time. It is not surprising, therefore, to find that we have had an increasing number of replacements. We would surely agree that any good placement job involves taking responsibility for replacements, but certainly there is a definite relation between the appreciable increase in the number of replacements and the shortage of homes. On top of these difficulties that have been accumulating over a period of time, we find ourselves now at a point where there is beginning to be an even greater demand upon foster home services for chil-

dren, and we would like to be able to meet this with as much security and steadiness as possible. Ultimately these qualities and the strength of the service are rooted in the character of our foster homes.

Whole Case Work Staff Does Home Finding

With this growing recognition of our present dilemma and what it is meaning for our whole placement program we begin to concern ourselves with ways of working on and with the problems involved. In order to try to discover how we might most economically proceed in this effort to secure more good foster homes, we decided, first of all, to examine and re-evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of our present system. Responsibility for recruiting, studying and selecting foster homes at the Children's Aid Society is carried by the whole case working staff. In this so-called decentralized method each worker is responsible for the home finding activity in her own district, as well as for placement and supervision of children. There are many real values in this way of working, some coming directly to the child, some reaching him through the foster home or case worker. The worker and foster mother have already lived through something together, first around the taking of a child and then around accepting the particular child presented. This means that they have established a relationship that has a mutual trust in it. One might say that there are dangers in the worker being too identified with the foster home, but if she has honestly been related to the home around the child and his needs, his place is already there and waiting for him. This preparation that has gone into a home by the worker who will continue with responsibility for the placement makes the worker so aware of what foster families have put into becoming foster families and where they will need her help most. For the worker who carries responsibility both for supervision and for home finding there is also the fact that she has immediate experience with children. This cannot help but keep her closely related to the many phases of a child's living and his needs, and consequently contributes greatly to what she brings to the home finding part of her job. There is also the value that comes from the recruiting of new homes by the agency representative who is already acquainted with her community through contacts around children in active foster homes. Moreover, the fact that she is known in the community, as well as being

familiar with it and its resources, usually makes her more approachable and accessible to prospective applicants.

We realized that the weakness for us in this decentralized system lay not in our method of studying homes but in our ability to get enough homes to keep a sufficient range of choice available. Perhaps this problem is inherent in any home finding set-up that is not concentrated in one person or department. Certainly a division of responsibility does tend to create a lack of balance in efforts to stir up interest and keep a steady flow of applicants. When home finding is not someone's full time work, it can so easily get lost in the midst of carrying other aspects of the job that may seem momentarily more pressing or more directly related to the child. It is really difficult to keep this simple but important fact, namely, the need for a constant supply of homes, keenly enough before a large group of workers. Therefore, while we were convinced that for us the values of our present structural set-up far outweighed the lacks, we recognized the need to take definite steps to bring home finding into the important place it must have in every worker's concern if we are to provide the children coming to us with adequate foster homes.

Out of this concern grew a decision to explore and evaluate what we do have in the way of good, strong homes in order to discover what we could learn from such a study that would help us in seeking more similarly usable families. A committee of case workers was formed to steer the project and undertake some assimilation of the findings. There was no thought that this study should be conclusive in any way or that it should be particularly inclusive. We hoped that it might prove an impetus, a means of stimulating a new and more vigorous interest in recruiting homes for children, that it might point out some ways of accomplishing our goal.

Each case worker in the permanent foster home department was asked to contribute material on a selected group of homes. From among her active foster families we suggested she choose a certain number that she felt were her best ones. It was designated that these were to be homes whose qualities make them most usable in what they have to offer a fairly wide range of children, and in their ability to work comfortably with the agency. It might be well to recognize here that the agency has numerous homes that we feel have worked out very successfully for a particular child, and we will certainly always need these special places, but for purposes of this study we deliberately limited the homes under consideration to those with wider possibilities

of usefulness. We requested specific information about the family set-up; the ages, occupations, education and financial standing of foster parents; their experience with children of their own and others. We were also interested in knowing how long these homes had been active with the agency and any significant change in feeling workers had about a home over a period of time. Finally we wanted to know through what channels these exceptional families had come to us and what were their community connections and activities.

The facts revealed in the compiled material were not particularly astonishing or new, but did clarify and confirm much of what we had known to be true of our strongest foster homes. In many instances our findings, with their convincing experience of the past, helped to reassure us about trying certain situations that, at first thought, one might be inclined to rule out on a rather arbitrary basis. We found that there were opportunities for widening our field of choice that we had overlooked heretofore, both in our consideration of the objective qualifications of applicants and in our publicity efforts. The study served to break down a little some of the natural fears and hesitations that one has in undertaking such a responsible job as choosing a home for a child.

The Use of the Younger Foster Parent

For example, it was interesting to consider the ages of foster parents in several different respects. There is always the question of what the young applicant has to offer, and we are inclined to be pretty fearful about accepting youthful, inexperienced couples. Yet in our study we discovered that some of our very best homes came to us in their twenties. Most of these were not recent acquisitions, however, which gave us pause for thought. The scarcity of recently acquired young homes in this selected group seemed to be due to two factors: that we were not accepting as many younger people and that many of those opened within the last few years would not as yet fall into this classification of exceptionally good homes. The significant inference here is that, with the supporting help of the agency, young foster parents can become increasingly valuable. When we stop to think of it, we realize it is so natural for foster parents to grow along with foster children as they would with their own, providing that they are endowed with this capacity in the first place. But because this parent-child relationship is not an entirely natural one, we must be very aware of the responsibility the agency has to assume in working with these less mature and less experienced families, and be

ready to contribute additional help. The survey pointed up pertinently, too, that those foster parents who started taking children when they were quite young were, in most cases, the families that had been active the longest. While there are a number of explanations why this is true, the important fact is that young homes do bring something to the job of being foster parents that they can sustain over a longer period of time. This obviously increases their usefulness to the agency and is well worth the initial and, if need be, continuing effort put into working with such homes.

The Older Foster Parent

When it comes to using more older applicants, we may want to shift somewhat from our usual feeling that it is wiser not to consider them. The risks involved are quite understandable and certainly we would think of older foster parents only for the older child or one who had some security with his own family. We would know that the agency might in some way have to be responsible for supplementing what a child would get in the home of elderly people. Although our study material did not give us a great deal to substantiate our feeling that there might be more possibilities than we had previously made use of in the group of older people applying to us, there were several instances of applicants in their late fifties or early sixties working out successfully. It was enough to strengthen our willingness to at least consider what older applicants might have that would be valuable to give children and not just exclude them automatically on the basis of age.

The Home of the Widow

Most of these good homes selected for our survey are made up of normal family units, with a foster father and mother and perhaps own children. There has always been a tendency to reject the homes of widows, except in rare cases, with the thought that one should offer the foster child the chance of experience with two parents. Yet it was revealed in our figures that a few of our specially selected homes were those of widows. It seems important to notice that in every instance there were older sons living at home who seemed to compensate partially for the lack of a father. So it is that, while holding to our belief that for most youngsters a complete family group is what we would ideally want, we are ready to be more flexible in considering fatherless homes.

Experience with Children as a Prerequisite

As we might expect, practically all of our exceptionally able foster parents had some experience with

children before applying to the agency. They had been actively associated with them through teaching, nursing, caring for relatives or previous boarding children or in raising their own. We are apt to think our most usable foster parents are those who have successfully reared or are in the process of bringing up their own family. We are somewhat afraid of the childless couple for a "boarding child" who can never be completely their own, afraid of the greatness of their need as well as of their inexperience. Surprisingly enough we found that almost one-sixth of these strong foster parents were couples who had never had any children of their own. As in the case of young foster parents, we can know that in such situations a great deal depends on the agency and its ability to help build up and bring out the potentialities of these families. It might also be mentioned here that there were several encouraging experiences of unusual foster mothers being able to successfully raise foster children along with their own of approximately the same ages, which is another type of situation that one sometimes mistrusts on the surface and does not explore freely or deeply enough.

How to Know the Prospective Foster Home

And so we began to have increasing conviction that we could comfortably and responsibly undertake to study certain foster home applications that in the past we may have eliminated too hastily from the acceptable group. We were especially sure that there are valuable, though perhaps undeveloped, possibilities in our young applicants. At the same time we realized that as we become more flexible about the so-called objective qualifications of applicants we will want to have more conviction than ever about the essential qualities of those homes we accept. We will want to really know that these families have, in varying degrees, to be sure, the sort of warmth and security, steadiness and flexibility that one desires for a child in a foster home. It follows logically that in order to know this, the worker must have a chance for real experience with a family; the process by means of which she builds up her knowledge of and feeling for a home, her confidence in them, her awareness of what is lacking and how she might hope to supplement these deficiencies. It does seem so important to allow time for the worker to explore with the applicant the realities of taking a foster child into her home and to have freedom to proceed in a way that will bring a foster home most quickly and most surely to a sound working relationship with the agency. Moreover, as we think ahead to the probability that workers will have less rather than more time to give to the supervision of active foster homes,

it would seem very sound to put extra effort, when possible, into the preparing of the new home. Much as we hope we will not have to put too great a burden upon foster mothers, we must needs face realistically what is ahead with our ever-increasing demands for service. There is going to be a real dilemma for us in that we want to accept more homes, and this means, as was pointed out above, homes that may need considerable help before they are able to give very much to a child; while, on the other hand, we should probably be exercising even more selection, knowing that we will be limited in the assistance that we can offer homes. There is no ready solution to this problem certainly, but perhaps one way of alleviating it is to attempt to start moving in our direction the sort of applicants who are most likely to be good prospects.

Publicity Methods in Home Finding

This job of actually recruiting new foster homes is, as we noted above, one that gets a little lost in the agency that operates with a decentralized system of home finding. We had, to be sure, in the past made some publicity efforts, rather sporadically perhaps and pretty much in relation to particular needs. It was the steady, underpinning kind that had been lacking. Now as we began to think of launching a more active recruiting program we recognized some of the inherent difficulties in any publicity for new homes. There is inevitable fearfulness and hesitancy in reaching out and asking for something you may have to reject. One can stir up plenty of complications in a locality where a number of homes have been turned down when you begin asking for more. The way in which publicity is planned and presented can help to lessen the unwanted responses, though never get rid of them entirely. This problem of rejections is one that we will just have to accept as accompanying publicity efforts and will have to handle responsibly as it arises. We will need to remind ourselves of the balance on the other side, what we gain in interest for children and eventually in homes for them. So often it turns out that a prospective foster parent needed just the added impetus that we can give through well-planned publicity to get to us. They may have known that such an agency existed but not enough about us to give them confidence to apply.

Here we turn again to our study material, to consider it from the point of view of what we could learn about taking this more active part in stimulating applications with the hope of increasing selection. We reviewed how these unusually good homes had

come to the agency and tried to discover what kind of interests and affiliations people of this sort had, feeling it would be around these interests that we could reach similar families.

Active Foster Parents, a Source for New Homes

It was immediately evident from the findings that our most fruitful source of homes is other foster families. By far the greater number of applicants hear of us first through active foster mothers. There was no way of knowing how many of these were motivated simply by their own feelings and needs and how many may have come as the result of some rather definite stimulation on the part of the agency. There were just a few reports to the effect that we had approached active foster mothers in order to obtain these homes. In many cases it was the children themselves who attracted the applicants first and led them to question the foster parents. In re-evaluating how we use foster families to help us in this way, we decided to make a more conscious effort to enlist their services. It was felt that a definite appointment to discuss our home finding problems and needs might prove more advantageous than merely bringing it up in connection with a supervision visit. Needless to say, the worker needs to be thoughtful and selective about which foster families she can ask for this sort of help. Moreover, it needs to be clearly understood between them that the foster mother is responsible only for suggestions and not for actually recommending or assisting in the selection of applicants. While some foster mothers might not feel right about suggesting such an undertaking to their friends, they would be willing to help us get in touch with local groups or refer us to persons in the community who could help develop a broader interest in our children. It was suggested, too, that foster fathers, who are frequently overlooked, might be called upon to participate in such a program. Although we are just beginning with this new sort of approach, the response to asking for assistance from active foster families already shows signs of becoming more productive.

Contacts with Local Organizations

Our survey pointed up further what we undoubtedly knew to be true, that the kind of people we want to reach, as represented by these special families, were usually active in local organizations. The most desirable foster parents do seem to be people that express themselves in some fashion outside their own homes. Almost without exception they had some church connection, and similarly an inter-

est in school affairs. In both urban and rural communities there are P.T.A. groups and mothers' clubs which draw foster parents. In the country areas there are granges which serve as social centers for our families; in the city districts, lodges and clubs. It was clear then that there are very definite and accessible channels through which we could reach people like our good foster parents. As we began to think about and work on these possible avenues of approach we found they were quite available. Some of our enterprises are being started in entirely new localities and this means lots of preparation and thoughtful planning as one goes into the unexplored area to seek out the best that there is. Several workers subscribed to local newspapers and perused them to acquaint themselves with key people and organizations that might prove useful. The next move, to the key people themselves, usually leads in turn to such organizations as were mentioned above that are apt to welcome a topic of such universal interest as children. In planning a program one might think of having a foster mother tell about her experience with children, with the agency worker there to carry her part. Coming from one of themselves, as it were, this presentation of our children sometimes gets across to prospective foster parents in a way that is much more related to what they know than anything they could get from an agency worker. For some people this would mean making the step toward application easier and less fearful. On the other hand, the case worker can present children and their needs in a broader scope and is herself an expression of the agency that dispels some of the unknown for those who might be hesitant about applying. For other audiences this might prove to be a more effective method.

Developing a New Area

One worker tried a valuable experiment of gathering together a group of key people in a new section she was wanting to develop. She approached the local dentist first, he being already acquainted with some of our children. It was his idea to assemble the two ministers of the town, the school principal, the president of the women's club and the local newspaper editor for an informal meeting with the worker. They discussed some of the children they knew in the community and the worker gave them typical stories of what our children are like and where they come from, as well as bringing them in touch a bit with the agency's way of functioning. Interest has branched out through each individual who participated and there have been concrete results in the form of appli-

cations and quite usable ones, for the most part. Another worker is introducing the agency in a large new area by working through the child welfare divisions of women's clubs. In a third unexplored district the agency sends a representative to a meeting of the local welfare council. In the pooling of these different experiences and the weighing of their values new methods for effectively reaching the sort of applicants we want are constantly opening up.

The Use of the Newspaper

The value of newspaper advertising as a means of acquiring new foster homes has always been open to question. The elimination necessary is apt to be time consuming and costly to the agency in comparison to the results. It appears from our survey that few of our best places were produced by this method, although for wage homes or for homes to meet a specific need, advertising has occasionally been necessary and brought in something usable. Here again we meet the problem of not being able to accept most of what comes in response to our stimulating, even though we thoughtfully limit what we ask for. Another approach is the use of newspapers for publicity of a more general nature. It is a comparatively untried field with us and one that would seem to warrant further exploration. News stories, giving a little about the agency, along with a bit of human interest material on children, could be effective. Reports of speeches or meetings such as those discussed above would serve to bring word of our children to wider audiences. Incidentally, it was noted in our study that the majority of foster families were more likely to read daily or weekly local news sheets than large city papers, a fact we need to keep in mind. It was felt that workers could definitely assume more responsibility in employing ways such as these to keep interest in their communities steadily and vitally geared to our children.

Thus out of this study grew a redefining of our responsibility to find homes for children. We realized that we needed as case workers, to build into our day-to-day job, the sort of telling about children and their needs that helps lay a foundation of interest that will steadily produce good homes for them. In the past we had relied too heavily on the hope that this interest was self sustaining and in the right direction. It seems clear that this is only partially true, that actually it needs to be the concern of each individual worker to keep interest alive if we are to accomplish our task of providing children with homes. It was very evident from our survey that there were numerous ways of doing this, many potential sources that

we have never utilized or at least not used creatively enough. We realize that we have only begun to touch the possibilities here and that the suggestions coming out of our working together on the problem are but beginnings. Certainly we have found it to be a valu-

able experience to take stock of ourselves and face anew this particular aspect of what is entailed in maintaining the quality of our placing service, the quality of living experience that we want for our children.

Interpreting Child Welfare Services to the Community

MARY S. KING

WORKING in a predominantly rural community which has not previously known a professionally trained case worker requires considerable adjustment in thinking and practice. How can one meet the demands of a community whose conception of Child Welfare work may be very different from one's own? How can one not only maintain the essentials of previous standards, but prove the worth of those standards, new though they may be to the community?

Development of Child Welfare Services in Licking County

The Licking County Child Welfare Services officially opened on December 2, 1940. For several years various individuals in the county had expressed interest in having something more in the way of a child welfare program. When this was made possible financially under the Social Security Act, Title V, part 3, the interested individuals and groups got together and requested the State Department of Welfare to send them a Child Welfare worker. A sponsoring committee was appointed to help her become oriented, and members of this committee have been very helpful.

A New Experience

My previous experience in rural communities (as well as my city experience) has always been as a representative of a well-established children's agency. It has been necessary constantly to remind myself that all agencies have started from scratch, and that a program can be built up only as rapidly as the community wishes it and can understand it. Interpretation, or community education, thus assumes major importance. But how to interpret?

Never before had I faced so much difficulty in defining case work to the layman and at the same time convincing him that it had some value. Shortly after my arrival, a patient and, I thought, clear exposition of case work in a specific situation was received by

the professional person to whom it was addressed with the comment: "Perhaps in another six months you can show us better what you mean by pointing out what you have done." Ultimately, practical demonstration is the test, often under conditions which make it a discouraging task. Six months is scarcely a long enough period; even at the end of a year individuals whom the case work program has helped seem lost in the mass of chronic problems.

Variety of Functions

A source of confusion is the multiplicity of functions of a Child Welfare worker. Sometimes she operates in the rôle of visiting teacher, at the request of the school, trying to find out why Johnnie is such a problem; sometimes as a medical social worker, following up a family in which the mother has just been discharged from the TB sanatorium; often she "investigates" reports of neglect (perhaps because the Humane Officer thinks it's a woman's job to remove the baby's diapers in a search for sores and chafing); she supervises wards of the Children's Home who are placed in boarding, free or wage homes, or others who are returned to doubtful family situations "on trial"; at the request of the judge she evaluates an adoptive situation where prospective adoptive parents have already acquired a child by fair means or foul.

In each case she must be clear what her job is, where it begins and ends, how it dovetails with someone else's. Unless she is clear herself she cannot satisfactorily explain her presence to the client, or even justify it. This generally means clarification first with the referring agency.

The location of one's office is of considerable importance. Because the Licking County Child Welfare worker started out with a desk in the Juvenile Court and now has a desk in the Juvenile Center, located in the courthouse basement, along with the two ADC workers and the Juvenile Officer, it is inevitable that to most of the public she is another representative of

the Juvenile Court; the knowledge that she is employed by the state, and paid with Federal funds, only adds to the weight of authority she carries.

Interpretation at Point of Referral

Naturally enough the community tends to refer to the new worker, introduced as a person of skill, training and experience, just those families who have always been "problems," perhaps for generations. It is important to face, at the outset, with the referring agency or individual as well as with one's self, the limitations of the service one can give, the possibility that one is powerless to help in a given situation. Over and over again one repeats: "We can help only when a family wants help." When, after due trial, it appears that the family does not, we may refer to the court authorities, or face the dismal fact that this is just a bad situation in which, for the present at least, case work cannot help. It may be that resistance on the part of the clients is too great; or it may be that their difficulties are tied up with economic and social conditions which must be remedied before any less tangible service can be given. The worker's problem then is to explain satisfactorily to the community her reason for refusing to accept a case or to continue with it.

Interpretation to Client

In meeting the individuals referred one has still another problem of interpretation. Here again time is required—time for the client to gain confidence in this strange new person. To someone who has had long experience with probation officers and authoritarian relief workers, the Child Welfare worker is just another meddler in private affairs; a representative of the community which looks down on him and to which he in turn is hostile. If the worker goes in simply because she is someone new ready to try her hand where others have failed, the resistance to her interference may be impossible to break through. If, however, referral occurs at a time of crisis, when the worker can be the vehicle of practical tangible assistance, the chances of establishing a helpful relationship are far greater.

Case Material

The following cases illustrate this distinction:

A. Mrs. Brown was referred by the relief worker because she spent her time roaming the streets with boy friends and neglected the children. Her husband, who had been on WPA, was unemployed because of illness and was supposed to go to the TB sanatorium. However, Mrs. B. would not consent, presumably be-

cause she wanted him to look after the children so that she might be free to run around. Two older children were married and out of the home; those remaining were Jack, 16; Gwendolyn, 13; Shirley, 11; Darlene, 8. Darlene had been taken away for a while by a wealthy couple from another state. They wanted to adopt her, but Mrs. Brown would not consent. The Child Welfare worker was sufficiently convinced of the need for protective service so that she accepted this case, first for evaluation, and later for major service.

2-27-41. Visited. Worker introduced herself, explaining that Miss J. had suggested that she call. Mrs. B. immediately asked worker in, but expressed surprise that Miss J. had referred her, as Miss J. had never visited in the home. Worker thought probably she might have visited when Mrs. B. was out as that was the statement Miss J. had made. Mrs. B. said Miss J. had not visited since they had lived at the present address. She had applied for relief a month ago and Miss J. had never visited.

She went on to describe her difficulties in obtaining relief, ending with the comment that:

Miss J. criticized her, saying she spent her time on the streets with different men. Harry Green used to come to visit but she had told him to stop because of the things Miss J. had said. She has to go up to Logan's grocery to get her food order so naturally she goes out occasionally.

Worker said that was one criticism, that she spent her time on the streets, and worker thought Miss J. must have some grounds for this. . . . Mrs. B. thought Miss J. should attend to her business and not go snooping around. All she should do was to find out whether or not they needed relief. No one had a right to interfere in anyone else's business.

Worker stated that that undoubtedly seemed true, but there was a legitimate reason in interfering in someone else's affairs and that was in the event the children were not receiving proper care. From what Miss J. had said, worker was concerned enough that she at least wanted to discuss matters with Mrs. B.

Mrs. B. said the children would be receiving proper care if they were getting enough relief.

She went on with a history of her husband's employment and unemployment. Worker then addressed Mr. B., who was sitting in the background smoking, and asked about his health. Mr. B. talked very intelligently about tuberculosis. His reluctance to go to the sanatorium for examination was based on an earlier experience. He had once been in another sanatorium, under observation, was discharged as having no signs of TB, but could not obtain employment because of his record. Mrs. B. then mentioned that she was a good friend of Mrs. Lane, nurse at the sanatorium, whom she called by her first and maiden name. She was anxious that worker talk with her and worker agreed.

Mrs. B. said that the worker could come at any time to see that the children were well taken care of. She talked about them at length and with affectionate pride. She described their experience with the Tripps, the couple who had wanted to adopt Dar-

lene. The Browns had become acquainted through a neighbor when the Tripps came here for their summer vacation. Her explanation of Darlene's return home was that Mrs. Tripp had had a nervous breakdown. She had continued her interest and showered all of them with gifts at Christmas.

The nurse at the TB sanatorium was interviewed. She felt that Mrs. B. was quite cooperative, but that Mr. B. was not. She had seen his record from the other sanatorium indicating that he did not have TB. She was waiting for referral from the doctor who had attended him in his recent illness, before asking him to come in. She thought Mrs. B. was sincerely fond of her children. She did not consider the situation very different from other homes of low standards. Mrs. B. likes to talk to someone and it might be helpful for worker to continue in the situation.

Worker did continue for a time. Mr. B.'s doctor did not refer him to the sanatorium and he returned to work. The Tripps continued their interest, supplying two quarts of milk a day at the B.'s request and sending occasional gifts. Mrs. B. seemed to have a faculty of getting what she needed for her children, so that they received more material advantages than others on the same economic level. One might wonder if they would not grow up to be beggars. But they presented no serious problems and Mrs. B. apparently had no need for a worker. Her visits were just another social contact. Therefore the case was closed.

B. The Greens were referred by the Probation Officer because they had placed their two children, Dottie, age 2, and Junior, age 1, with two couples for adoption. The couples had responded to an ad which the Greens had run in the local paper. Mr. G. had been told by the Probation Officer in no uncertain terms that he could not just dispose of his children in this way.

Mr. G. was introduced to worker by the Probation Officer. Worker explained that she was interested in knowing what plans he had for his children and in helping him with them. He was extremely defensive. He and his wife were planning to separate and could not agree on the amount of alimony. He was earning \$20 a week and had offered her \$10, but she wanted him to pay the rent in addition. She was receiving \$24 a month alimony for two older children by a previous marriage and he thought she should be able to manage. He said she went out and got drunk, leaving him to care for the children, and now he felt he did not want to give her any money to keep them. She

would take care of the older two but not of the younger two.

Worker later talked with Mrs. G. when she came in to collect alimony. Worker had left word at the clerk's office that she wanted to see her.

Mrs. G. looked sullen and discouraged. Worker explained that she was interested in knowing just how she felt about placing the children and said she had been asked to see if the homes were suitable and to help work out plans. Mrs. G. said she hoped to be able to take them back again in a few days. She did not intend to give them up for adoption. She would make some arrangement for them since she was separating from her husband and had no work whereby to support them. As soon as she gets work she can leave them with her mother. She could not do this yet because she was not employed. . . . Mrs. G. went on to say that she had not wanted to put the ad in the paper. It was her husband who had done it. She had not known he was going to. Worker had understood he put it in because she did not want the children. She replied that the things he said about her were lies. She doesn't run around nights and get drunk. She could not take care of the children because he did not provide. Worker asked about the \$10 he had agreed to pay and she said she knew he would not pay this. He had been married before and has not supported his two children by that marriage. She added that her first husband would not pay for the support of his children if she did not take care of them. Worker said that he might pay for them because there was no other plan he could make. Also she might be better able to take care of them than of the two younger ones. She said she treated them all alike. Worker asked about the other children.

At this point Mrs. G. gave names, birth dates, etc. In response to questioning she told a little bit about her first marriage. Her parents were separated and she had married to get away from home. As she talked she expressed doubt that her mother would want to care for the children. She wondered what to do next. This was Saturday. Before talking with Mrs. G. worker had talked with both of the couples who had come in to the court and had arranged to visit on Tuesday. Worker arranged to visit Mrs. G. on Wednesday morning, since she preferred to have worker come to the house. Mrs. G. mentioned that she had previously tried to place the children in the Children's Home and had been refused.

On Tuesday Mrs. G. left a message in worker's absence asking her to call that day. Worker visited and mentioned the message.

Mrs. G. said they had come to an agreement. They had decided to stay together for the sake of the children. They realized that they had made a serious mistake in giving them up. However, at the time it seemed the only thing to do. Worker said at times one feels desperate and driven to do something which one would not do otherwise. However, since they had taken this step worker thought they should be very sure what they wanted to do. Mrs. G. said they were sure they wanted to keep the children. Worker said that if they do take the children she would be glad to keep on visiting and then if things got bad again perhaps she could help them with plans. Mrs. G. said she would be glad to have her do this. She asked when they should get the children or if the children would be brought to them. Worker said she thought it was up to them to get the children. It would be necessary to obtain the Probation Officer's consent. Worker would talk to him and let them know. All worker had been asked to do was to approve the homes and she did not have the authority to say what should be done with the children.

Mrs. G. wanted to know if worker had investigated the homes. Worker said she had but it would take time to complete an investigation. She knew the people wanted the children very much and they would be disappointed to give them up. However, it was better for the children to go before they got too attached if they were not going to keep them. She thought the children had good homes there. Mrs. G. said she thought they could do more for the children than she and her husband but they just did not want to give them up. Worker wondered about the possibility of her mother's helping care for them. She said she did not think her mother could do much. Her mother thought it was terrible for her to give them up. She said she thought her father might be coming to live with them. Worker wondered if his coming would help matters or make more friction. . . . She thought it would help because he and her husband got along well together. Her husband had invited him to come. Worker wondered what he thought about her giving up the children. She said he did not say. He leaves decisions up to her and says it is her affair. However, she thought he did not like it. Worker thought perhaps other people were criticizing her for giving up the children and for that reason she wanted them back. However, other people did not always know the circumstances. Mrs. G. said she had not wanted to give them up at all, it was just that she could not seem to manage. It was her husband who put the ad in the paper.

It was arranged for Mr. G. to come in the following morning.

Mr. G. in office at 8:30. Worker asked how he felt now about the children and he said that they wanted them back. He did not know why he had ever put the ad in except that his wife had driven him to it. Worker stated that his wife denied the charges he had made and wondered if he trusted her to take care of the children now. He thought she had learned a lesson; if she does not take care of the children he will have to do something about it. Worker said it was a serious thing which they had done and she did not know how the court would feel. . . . Worker phoned Probation Officer who said for the G.'s to take the children home. They should be made to understand how serious this was. They could be sent to prison. . . . If the children are neglected they will be removed.

Worker reported this to Mr. G. He was willing for the worker to visit. Arrangements were completed for him to get the children.

Worker has kept in touch with this situation, seeing much more of Mrs. G. than of Mr. G. When an emergency rose, they turned to the worker. Mrs. G. became ill and Mr. G. stayed home from work to take care of the children. Worker was instrumental in getting temporary relief and housekeeping service so Mr. G. could return to work. No doctor had been called and, although Mr. G. quite obviously wanted worker to call one, she left this responsibility with him. It finally became necessary for Mrs. G. to go to the hospital, which meant temporary placement of the children. It has been difficult to tell how the G.'s really feel about the children. If anything should happen to Mrs. G., Mr. G. would probably give them up. It remains to be seen what plan will be worked out when Mrs. G. recovers.

This seems to us a situation where the Child Welfare worker can be of real service and should continue actively in it.

In the effort to establish one's self as different from the authoritative person an individual has previously known, the tendency is to bend over backward and to become too identified with the client, too blind to the community's attitude. In response to an appeal for emergency help, the relief worker will then remark, kindly but patronizingly, "These families take advantage of you. We've known Henry a long time and he never could manage." The relief worker was right. But how to get across the belief that Henry might gradually learn to manage better; that he might be encouraged to stand on his own feet when there was firm ground to stand on, but must be given support when that ground was shaking.

Sources of Referrals

Probably because the juvenile judge had been active in getting a Child Welfare worker as well as because the worker's desk was set up temporarily in the Juvenile Court, the early referrals came chiefly from the court. Since the Chief Probation Officer is also placing agent for the Children's Home, most parents desiring placement for their children apply to him. If the parent is able to pay board, he is referred to the Child Welfare worker who licenses boarding homes in accordance with the state law. The decision to place in the Home or in a foster home is usually made on a financial basis. Only occasionally is a child placed boarding at public expense.

It has been interesting to note the increasing variety in sources of referral throughout the year. Of fourteen referrals during December, 1940, eight came from the court, three from the County Relief, and three from a local service club in one of the villages (a speaking engagement before this group had been arranged for the Child Welfare worker by the Probation Officer). In January, 1941, six out of nine referrals came from the court, two from the State Department, one from a physician who attended an informal meeting at which the worker spoke. In the course of the year a total of ten families and one adoptive home were referred as a direct result of a speech or attendance at a meeting and five families and one adoptive home as the result of conferences with physicians, pastors and teachers on other cases. The first request for service directly from a parent came in March, 1941, and during 1941 there were five requests from parents, relatives, or a child. Some of the referrals from the court (one-third the year's total) have resulted in minor service only, because the kind of service we could offer was not wanted or because more authority was needed. Those which have been accepted for major service have generally

been situations in which placement was requested, either by the parent or by the court. Referrals from schools (of maladjusted children) have generally resulted in acceptance for major service.

Problems of Placement

One phase of the job which has called for a radical readjustment is that of adoptive placements. The Juvenile Court usually makes these, or sanctions the adoption by a local family of a child acquired through a physician or attorney. When an unmarried mother, with whom the Child Welfare worker has been working decides to give up her apparently normal baby, there is no possibility of temporary boarding home placement. If she does not find an adoptive home, the Probation Officer will. When one has always worked in agencies where babies are placed for adoption only after very careful study, involving at least one psychological examination, and an opportunity to observe how the child relates to people, it requires great confidence in one's own judgment to place a very young baby without benefit of anything but knowledge of background and a satisfactory medical re-

port. Supervision of the child in the home during the six-month waiting period required by law may be a real contribution; arrangements can be made for psychological examinations and the waiting period may be extended if advisable.

Boarding home placements present another problem. When the child is a ward of the Children's Home, placed out because his previous experiences make it seem undesirable for him to be placed with a large group of children, an important criterion of a foster family is the amount of board they require. If two approved homes are available, the one which charges the least gets the child. When a child is placed by his parent, the worker can offer no assurance that the boarding parent will receive his money.

It is a problem to know how to raise or change standards in this field. The community accepts new practices slowly.

I do not know how typical my experience has been. Every county, like every case, presents its own problems, is distinctly individual and must be recognized as such. But just as various human beings have problems in common, so do the counties.

The Focus of Case Work in a Children's Institution*

MAURICE BERNSTEIN

CASE WORK service can make the experience of being away from the community a rich preparation for each child's healthier return. To do this, it must begin at intake. Here, in the very beginning, it is necessary to point out the dangers in an intake process not geared to the function of the institution and the purpose for which it is to be used by parents and children. The struggle around whether or not to place a child can do much to clarify for parents their basic relationship with their children. It may condition the use they will make of the institution and establish the perspective for eventual return. In a careful intake process many parents are helped to see that placement is basically not what they really wish. Thus, they have been able to re-orient themselves in terms of relationship with their children so that either through their own strength, or the utilization of other community resources, the child may be spared separation. We have also found that parents have moved more easily in using the institution after placement by virtue of their experience with the in-

take worker. The intake process can be summarized by stating that it includes perspective for discharge. The parent knows that he has not given up his child completely and that he has the right to share in planning. He is moved to think in terms of reorganizing his life so that eventually it can include the return of the child or so that the child can be free to live in the community with other relatives or in a foster home.

Reception of Child

Since we see each child leaving the community with some feelings of insecurity, we have found it very important to set the stage for the best utilization of the institution and its case work service. Thus the reception of the child in the institution is considered a very important part of the case work process. We have frequently found it advisable for the social worker to meet the child in the city and be the one to bring the child to the institution, using the hour of the trip out for reassurance and for some explanation as to how she will be related to the child in the institution. The social worker, during the beginning period, also makes clear to the child what the institution can offer and what he can contribute to

* The case discussion was prepared by Jacob Hechler, Supervisor, Institution Case Work Department, New York Association for Jewish Children, and is based on case material of Frances Cofino, Mildred Rabinow, and David Hallowitz of that organization.

the institution. Thus, there are discussions frequently on what each individual may expect in terms of cottage placement, activities, school placement, institution rules, visiting arrangements, etc. Since we know this to be a trying period, the social worker attempts to see the child almost daily in order to make clear to the child the ways in which she can be of unique service if the child wishes. The psychiatrist also sees the child to ascertain whether this is an individual who needs her specialized service as well as the service of the case worker. After this, the social worker sees the child regularly in response to need, both as the child sees it and as seen by the worker. The social worker will see the cottage parents to interpret the experience the child has had before coming to the institution, the difficulties presently being experienced, and the perspective. The social worker will confer with the psychologist who has probably seen the child shortly after admission. The psychologist, on the basis of psychometric tests and the child's achievement, makes arrangements for grade placement. The social worker will contact the doctor in order to be in a position to interpret any medical recommendations both to the child and to the parents.

Probably nothing we can do can make up for the serious insecurity and emotional deprivation which children sent to institutions experience through broken homes, loss of parents, neglect and rejection. Yet, because of just such experiences, there can hardly be enough individualization of children. It can be set down as principle that the more individualization achieved within the group setting, the better those charged with institutional administration carry out their responsibility. It is possible, by supplementing various special services—case work, psychiatric, psychological, educational, etc.—to extend and deepen the process of individualization.

As space is limited I have thought it wiser to confine my discussion to the specialized service of case work. Case work in an institutional setting seems to us to be of two general kinds, though neither is completely exclusive of the other. We see case work focused around the meaning of placement and case work as therapy.

As regards the first, the social worker is in constant touch with the family during the entire period of stay, responding to the family's need as seen by the family and by herself.

The relationship of parents to children changes and this change or movement should be understood and utilized for the purpose of strengthening relationships where they can be strengthened and enabling

acceptance of limitations where these exist. We have found that parents move more freely where case workers focus on the meaning of placement itself. This can be seen best in discussions of the way the child is using separation, what it means to both parent and child to be away from each other, and the use they are making of the institution. There is another focus of case work. This is therapy in the sense of the utilization by a child of a relationship with a social worker. Therapy is used best where children are deeply conflicted about their own problems and manifest behavior symptoms as a result. Here the main function of the social worker may be in his capacity to offer a non-critical friendship. In such a relationship the child can feel free to act out hostility, which may be at the base of the conflict. Such children are frequently torn between conflicting impulses, such as loving and hating a confusing parent, wanting and not wanting to be infantilized, etc. Perhaps both of these views of case work service can be best made clear through illustrations.

The first case focused around the meaning of placement is that of a girl, Marian P., who, at the age of thirteen, was committed by the Children's Court. Together with several other girls she had been involved in stealing from a store. Investigation disclosed that she was living with her mother and a brother, two years old. The father had left home when Marian was about eight as a result of marital discord, which began almost at the beginning of the marriage. This discord came about somewhat through the irresponsibility of the mother in budgeting matters and her neglectful attitude toward the home, but mostly because of her sexual promiscuity with other men. The last child was of another paternity. Although separated from his family, the father nevertheless maintained a thin connection with it, chiefly through Marian, whom he met occasionally.

Although originally the child was brought to court as a delinquent, the home situation was so disorganized and the care of the children so lax that the court changed the classification to neglect. It is especially interesting that Marian's delinquent behavior began around the time of the birth of the second brother. Shortly before the birth of this boy the mother indicated to Marian in a note that she soon would give birth to another child. Marian was quite aware of her mother's promiscuity and of the fact that the paternity of this child was by another man. Perhaps, and about this we can only speculate, the delinquent development was a resentful reaction to her mother's behavior; that is, she as much as

said, "since my mother is bad, I will take my revenge by being bad, too."

At any rate, Marian's stay in the institution, and finally her leaving, presented a number of placement problems and problems in relationship which could not have worked out as favorably as they did without the case worker. Although only thirteen, she was rather tall, somewhat husky, with a ruddy complexion and a warm, attractive, outgoing personality. She knew she was sent to the institution because of neglect at home, and although lonesome, accepted it, at least verbally, as a means of "getting away from the old gang." She regarded the placement as temporary. Throughout her stay in the institution, which lasted three years, there were wide variations in her behavior, sometimes hostile outbursts. In no way, however, was she a disturbed child in a psychiatric sense; rather her disturbance seemed to arise directly as a result of her situation, and it is important to note that at those times, when her situation promised to become better, her behavior in the cottage and everywhere else on the grounds became correspondingly calmer. This was especially so when her problems reached a solution.

She had spent thirteen years with her mother and had developed certain ties with her. At the same time, she had also become uncertain about her and extremely uneasy when her mother bore a second son. Toward her father she carried something of a grudge, blamed him for deserting the family and in general for the plight of herself and the family. Notwithstanding this, she also showed that she had a yearning for him which she did not often allow to become overt. About the time Marian came to the institution, her mother became ill with multiple sclerosis and was hospitalized. The brother was placed in a foster home. About June, 1939, we note the following statement from the record: "She showed considerable anxiety at her mother's physical condition and her younger brother's whereabouts. The mother had been writing disturbing letters cursing the father, demanding that the children choose between the mother and the father and describing her hardships. Following these letters Marian is quite depressed, restless and anxious to return home." As this shows, Marian's placement situation not only deprived her of a home, but confused and upset her in so far as it inhibited her natural desire to love both parents.

The mother's condition became worse and finally developed into a hopeless stage, so that now her hospitalization appears permanent. As her mother's condition became worse, Marian was forced to look

more toward developing a relationship with her father, the only possible tie left her. This, however, could not be easy. Although she had some good feelings toward him, nevertheless, as already indicated, she was angry and hostile as well as fearful and uncertain of him. Clearly, she needed to be helped in her impulse to go toward him.

After the child had been in the institution a little over a year, she thought there were things about the institution which she did not like any more and she expressed a desire to be transferred to a foster home. The case worker suggested that she talk this over with her father. Marian hesitated at first, said she would do that, but added that he had no right, in view of his past treatment of her and her family, to have a say in the matter. Nevertheless, fearfully, she did see her father and his answer was "no"; he insisted that she stay in the institution because for the first time in years he felt that she was in a stable environment. While Marian seemed to acquiesce in his decision when discussing this with him, actually she did not accept it. In the institution she reacted with restlessness and was generally upset.

Later, the worker indicated to the child that keeping her real feelings to herself about leaving the institution would have no value for her since her father would not know that they existed and the worker offered to be present at another meeting with Marian and her father. Marian seized on this eagerly, with the statement that if the worker were present, she was sure she could tell her father things that were bothering her. This difficult action was possible for her only if the worker could share it with her. In November, 1940, an interview took place which marked a turning point in the case. It should be remembered that while this was going on the child was corresponding with the mother and occasionally visiting her at the hospital and observing her growing emaciation. The interview which followed opened the eyes of the father to the suffering of his child and brought out his positive feelings for her and at the same time enabled the child for the first time to come closer to him.

Marian was nervous and upset at the prospect of this interview. Worker attempted to reassure her, suggesting that her wish to leave the institution did not mean that she was a bad girl. When the worker told the father that Marian had not accepted his plan for her to remain at the institution, he immediately said that if there was any question of foster home, his answer was emphatically "no." He wants her to come home when she's ready for discharge. Marian wanted to know when this would be. The father said he couldn't say. He hoped a real estate deal would bring him enough money to re-establish his home. Since Marian seemed so anxious to go, he was willing to consider a foster home. Marian at this point said she didn't want a foster home, she wanted to be home with him. The father laughed at this and minimized

her feelings. He said it was not so much that she wanted to go home as that she wanted to have freedom, parties, boys. Marian remarked that her father couldn't understand that she might care about him. Father asked Marian what it was that she was dissatisfied with about the institution, and Marian said she missed the personal feeling, she missed having her mother's love. Her father became quite sarcastic about this and said, "Yes, she loves you with a frying pan over your head." Marian cried and said that the fact that she was disciplined by her mother did not mean that her mother did not love her. Other mothers discipline their children too. Marian became more and more hysterical as she defended her mother, and finally sobbed aloud, "leave me alone." At this point the father's eyes filled with tears too and he seemed very much upset. He told Marian to go ahead and cry because she had plenty to cry about. Marian left the office for a while.

When Marian had gone, Mr. P. wanted to know the nature of the difficulties at the institution. Was Marian truanting or was she acting up in any way? I informed Mr. P. that the nature of the difficulties did not lie so much in the fact that Marian was disturbing at the institution. I was concerned with the fact that Marian seemed disturbing to herself. Institutional life is restricting, especially for a child who has been accustomed to such unlimited freedom as Marian. It is entirely understandable that she would fret at having to remain at the institution, especially when she is just now in the process of growing up. However, more important than any of these things we felt was the lack of a warm, personal relationship which Marian missed so much and which she was naturally seeking. I told Mr. P. that Marian was so anxious to have his good opinion that she did not let him know how dissatisfied she actually was, but we at the institution could see that she was restless and unhappy. She had made a good deal of progress in the past year and we would not want her to regress now because of bad planning.

Mr. P. now seemed more receptive to our point of view that Marian should not stay on much longer at the institution, but, nevertheless, he stated that it was quite impossible for him to think of taking her home now. He himself has no home and lives in a furnished room. At this point Marian returned and I asked her whether she, herself, had any plan to suggest. Marian said "no" she had not. It seemed quite impossible for her to go to her family now, but she was willing to stay on at the institution if she could only plan for a definite discharge date.

Father said he would do his best to take her home at the earliest possible time, and meanwhile offered that she could come in for city trips and week-ends as often as she was permitted from now on. Marian seemed quite pleased about this and wondered whether her father would be able to afford the extra expense. Mr. P. assured her that it would be all right.

There followed a considerable period, approximately a year and a half, during which this process of the developing relationship between the child and her father went through many ups and downs, although in the main it gradually progressed. At this time, Marian no longer wished to consider the foster home plan which we had at first proposed; instead, she pressed the father to re-establish a home so that they could live together. Actually, however, he could not do that. At times he thought it might be possible but in the end he was obliged to postpone this. Inwardly, however, Marian was not sure whether he loved her, and the question about taking or not taking her home soon became the issue around which she tended to test this out. During this period she was frequently upset. Her behavior in the cottage was difficult. Once she ran away from the institution. Such be-

havior only tended to stimulate fears in the father. In May, 1941, when the worker saw Mr. P., he seemed depressed and discouraged by the fact that Marian hadn't made a better adjustment. Since she had come to the institution after a charge of stealing, her difficulties made him feel she was becoming a delinquent. He could not erase from his mind his fear that she would become like her mother. The worker writes:

"I tried to give him the feeling of what Marian was going through. Her sense of being lost and estranged from the family, her uneasiness with her own father, whom she really did not know very well; her uncertainty about where she would live in the future. In addition to all this were some of her own fears that she was really bad. Mr. P. said that perhaps these things were true. On the other hand, he was not in a position to take her home, I said. It would be important for him to make clear to Marian that he could not for some time consider having her at home. I thought Marian would be able to accept this. Mainly, however, perhaps he could try to see her more often so that they could really get closer together."

In the course of time, however, although through many disappointments and constantly with the worker facilitating the process by support, explanations, suggestions, and always with an understanding of what both the child and the father were going through, the misunderstandings and consequent bad feelings which both had had for each other diminished and the positive feelings, which were inhibited, gradually became dominant. It was only at the point where the child became convinced that the father really loved her that she became calm and satisfied; there was then a glow about her and her general behavior in the institution was entirely changed. Both seemed to understand more of what each had been going through and this broke down the misunderstandings about each other. It is to be noted, also, that when the child felt certain about her father's affection for her, she was then able again to ask for foster home placement.

Summing up her work on the whole case, the case worker has this statement in the record:

During the child's stay in the institution she has, in the first place, given up the delinquent behavior which led to her commitment to the institution; she has matured and has developed a greater sense of self-confidence and at the same time has clarified for herself her relationship with her parents. The result of this has been that she has more and more separated herself from the mother and has developed a much stronger tie to the father. This makes it possible for her to look forward to living with him eventually. For the father, also, there has been a greater clarification with regard to his relationship to Marian, and in the course of this clarification there has emerged on his part much stronger positive feelings than had been before. This also makes it possible for him to plan a life including Marian, to think of establishing a home for her in the future. We believe that placement in a foster home would make it possible for this process to continue and would serve as a transition between placement and discharge to the father.

Leaving the institution after a period of almost three years of living there, leaving the worker with whom she has had such a strong relationship, and leaving all her other associates in the institution, was no simple thing. Besides, there were the usual fears that go with making big changes of this kind. Marian indicated some anxiety about facing the new experience. She asked whether she could go to the home of one of her cottage friends. She was restless at school and in the cottage. The worker went with her to the first interview with the Foster Home Bureau worker. Marian held on to the worker's hand like a frightened little girl. Her fears were relieved only after she found she liked the new worker. When her questions about the foster home were answered, she settled down in the institution. She received a commendation card for her unusual contribution to the cottage. She had not expected this and was thrilled, since it was a very concrete expression of the fact that she had been making a much better adjustment.

This case has been followed through in some detail because it appeared to be an excellent example of the value of case work in preparing a child to move on toward living in the community. Although Marian is not returning to live with her father at present, the stage certainly has been set for their eventual coming together. In the meantime, Marian is living with the secure feeling that her father loves her and wants her and this in itself has freed her sufficiently to go into a foster home experience with a positive attitude toward it and ready to use it to the utmost. She has achieved a certain freedom in adjusting herself to necessity.

It was not the intention here to present a fully developed statement on the rôle and technique of the case worker in the institution. In the case cited above it is to be noted that there was no particular psychiatric pathology. The difficulties centered around problems of placement and the feelings of the father and child around these problems. We witnessed how the case worker helped both to meet these problems and how the child especially matured through working them out. Whatever therapy took place in this case was achieved as a result of the working through of the placement problem as such. It was necessary for this child, if there were any such possibilities, to build up a relationship with her father. Both misunderstood each other and felt vaguely angry and resentful of each other because of this misunderstanding. Neither was free to express the yearning for the other. The rôle of the case worker was to help to get them to come together, to understand each other more and thus to help them

give up their negative feelings for the positive feelings that had been suppressed.

A large percentage of the problems of children in institutions are around just such questions of placement and of family ties. There are also a large number which manifest themselves in such disturbed behavior as to require direct therapy if they are to benefit from the institution experience. In this institution the case workers also carry this function much in the same way as in a child guidance clinic. Thus, broadly speaking, without lessening the varied and numerous problems that the case worker faces, the needs of children suggest two necessary services, one that deals with problems that are primarily around questions of placement, and the other with problems that are primarily around questions of behavior and psychiatric disturbances which require therapy. Of course, such sharp divisions are not possible in actual work because too often it is not clear where one ends and where the other begins, but for purposes of clarification it is possible to state that at times the placement problem is uppermost and at other times the psychiatric problem is uppermost.

The case of Sally K. illustrates the second type of service of the Case Work Department, i.e., therapy, in this instance relationship therapy. In this type of work it is interesting to note, in the material of the records, that very little of the child's reality problems on the grounds even come up for discussion. Rather, the content usually deals with the emotional interplay between the child and the worker.

Sally came to the institution at the age of eight together with an older brother. The father deserted when she was a baby. The mother maintained the two children since the time of his desertion. She is a person of great energy, extremely active and has managed to maintain her family intact to a certain extent, despite frequent changes in jobs because of her mental illness. Her mental illness, which does not necessitate hospitalization, manifests itself chiefly by a mild delusional system.

Sally, I. Q. 140, presented a delightful, outgoing personality with a tremendous amount of energy, but had a rather difficult problem in behavior when she first came to the institution. The symptoms were chiefly around the tendency to moodiness and a great deal of hyperactivity, a strong tendency to kiss almost everyone with whom she came in contact, also to kiss inanimate objects. It was necessary to focus treatment around this behavior problem if we wished to have any hopes of retaining and helping her mature in the institution and in the community. The mother subsequently got a defense job in Philadel-

phia and corresponds with them from that point. It was seen at once that the case worker would in this case have to utilize direct therapy.

For a period of some five months Sally was seen twice a week for an hour each period. Being an identifying sort of personality, she very quickly developed a strong positive relationship with the case worker who, by the way, happened to be a male worker. She very soon put him in the position of a father; in fact quite often she referred to him as her father in both direct and indirect ways. However, almost from the first interview, after her early fears had dissipated, she sought to control the interview situation by trying to stay over her time, by trying to induce the worker to see her exclusively, by trying to take out playthings not permitted out of the room, by attempting to kiss the worker profusely, etc. As she was refused the power of controlling the interview situation too greatly, her negative feelings became centered around the worker, and not infrequently she burst out into temper tantrums against him with angry hostile remarks and with threats. Her strong tie to the worker, however, and the worker's genuine affection for her, which she certainly felt, kept her coming to the interviews. For the first period, lasting approximately three months or so, the interviews, in addition to containing strong elements of positive feeling of both toward each other, also contained elements of very severe conflict. Her outbursts were accepted by the worker in a non-critical and understanding way, and even at times with some interpretation of her behavior. She was acting in this way because she had not learned to accept necessary limitations and only by controlling situations could she feel a keen sense of pleasure and of power. Perhaps she could learn to accept certain necessary limitations and have pleasure too. Over and over again she kept up her fighting, but gradually one saw the emergence of more and more ability to accept the limitations imposed, and at the same time to feel a sense of pleasure in doing this.

Throughout this period the worker was obliged to maintain a very consistent attitude of understanding and acceptance, of not allowing himself to be ruffled or be drawn into attitudes containing feelings of resentment. As Sally improved in the interviewing situation, her improvement carried over into her cottage, her classroom and grounds generally. There was a rather rapid development in maturity; her hyperactivity and moodiness lessened very appreciably and her tendency to kiss everybody and everything lessened considerably.

In working with this child in relationship therapy,

the worker utilized two main principles in the growth process: first of all, the identification of the child with the worker. This, as we know, is one of the most powerful growth producing elements in human life. Secondly, in meeting her demands for the control of the interview situation, the worker did not counter her feelings with antagonistic feelings of his own, but rather helped her by virtue of his own steady and consistent attitude to develop herself to the point where she could accept the limitations imposed with a degree of pleasure. When he gave her no justification to feel angry with him, she had to take within herself a certain responsibility for her own thinking and actions with regard to the worker. This gave her a chance to work all this through and to gain the freedom to relate herself to people without domination.

In the citation of the two cases mentioned, we have not gone into many features which are no less important and in some instances more important than the case work process as such. We have not mentioned the work of the cottage parents, of the recreational workers, etc., nor of the interplay of their work with the case work department. This is a separate problem and a very big one, and could not possibly be gone into here. Nevertheless, it should be clear that we have isolated the work of the case worker only in order to examine it more thoroughly. In the actual life of the child and working through of his problems, the work of the case worker is only one part of the job.

In conclusion, we should like to suggest some concepts which have helped us understand more clearly our function in relation to the problem of preparing children for return to the community.

The main purpose of any institution for dependent children is to strive to help children achieve independence as quickly and as solidly as possible, and by this is meant enabling children to function with as great freedom as possible. This calls for the development of the capacity to understand the full meaning of necessity and to learn to live with it, to have courage to be free in the sense of being able to exercise intelligent choice according to one's years. Maturity includes the capacity to carry appropriate responsibility. These concepts are basic to all education, school and parental, but seem to us to enable us to achieve better focus in the development of institutional programs. An institution can be examined as to its success in helping children carry appropriate responsibility and use freedom. Too often institutions surround children with excessive limitations. Thus they limit opportunities for taking the risks

associated with responsibility and the power to make choices.

Specialized services, such as psychiatric treatment, psychological study, educational guidance, case work service, all have their contribution to make in freeing children to grow towards their maximum potentialities. These, together with the cottage parents' service, in a sense the most specialized of all institutional services, but ignored here only because it is not the subject of this paper, give depth and meaning to the basic group experience of children in the institution. They are made necessary by the very fact that going to an institution is a unique experience in our society. Almost no child can be separated from his family and other community ties without being hurt. There is a kind of security in belonging to even an inadequate family, to school groups, to groups in the community, etc. This is to some extent lost when a child is withdrawn and placed in an institution which, in spite of our interpretation, is seen by others as well as by the child himself as an orphanage—this despite the contradiction that most institutions have children with either one or both parents living. The loss of security

interferes with growth in capacity to carry responsibility and use freedom in the institution and, more important, in the community while under care and after discharge.

If we have the goal suggested in mind, of enabling children to accept appropriate responsibility and grow into the wise use of freedom, then we must be able to orient our program so that it functions efficiently for each individual child. As I see it, this is where case work service has helped us most. Institutions have varying degrees of success in the use of group experience by children. However, it has always been very difficult for those responsible for the group program to be able to reconcile the necessities of the group with the interests of the individual. Experience is beginning to show that unless individuals are particularized as such with someone being solely concerned for their individual problems in relation to separation from their family—adjustment to the institution, use of community resources, return to the family—the child misses the full value of what the institution itself can mean to him.

Institution and Foster Home Care as Used by an Agency Offering Both Services

EVA BURMEISTER

How Does the Agency Decide at Intake Which Type of Care the Child Needs

Foster homes are the answer to the needs of most children who cannot remain in the homes of parents and relatives. The majority of children requiring placement away from their own homes should have this type of care. Institutions are needed for the comparatively small numbers who, for various reasons, cannot accept foster home care or who, if placed, might not have good chances for successful adjustments. Without attempting to discuss all types of children for whom placement in foster homes is the right solution, there are a few which should be mentioned. For these, at the point of placement, foster home rather than institutional care is definitely indicated. First, the needs of babies and pre-school children can best be met in foster homes. In their physical growth and, more important, in their emotional care and development, they need the affectionate response, the teaching and training, and the con-

stancy of one single mother person. Not only does group care deprive babies and small children of many normal emotional satisfactions, but there is danger of psychological retardation as well. The child with no family ties also needs a foster home, either an adoptive or a boarding home, in which he may stay for the entire period of his childhood and early adolescence. Children of the adolescent age do better in foster homes where they can enjoy a greater independence than is possible in most institutions, and where they can spend the important teen age years in the setting of normal family life. In general, the following children should have foster home care: babies, always; pre-school children, in all but the very exceptional cases; and any other children needing placement away from home who can, and whose relatives can, accept and adjust to this type of care.

The institution which is maintained for the care of relatively small numbers offers a service to some of the children whose needs cannot be met in foster

homes. Among these is the child of recently divorced or separated parents. Often, in divorce cases, the child has been played by one parent against the other, or each parent has tried to win him to his side. Father and mother enumerate each other's shortcomings, and pull the child in on decisions and into tense emotional situations filled with confusion, bitterness, disappointments and uncertainties. Not only are the parents involved, but often grandparents, aunts, uncles, and the girl friend of the father and boy friend of the mother, also enter into the situation.

During the course of divorce actions, children are subjected to situations confusing and upsetting to them. This is particularly true in those cases which come to the attention of family courts, in which custody is being contested. The child loses the home which, however unsatisfactory it appears to others, may mean security to him. His parents, absorbed in matters far beyond his ability to comprehend, have let him down. Everything having value to him has crashed. A child having had such an experience would become more confused by the introduction of boarding parents. Here would be a foster father and foster mother on whom he might project the feelings of rejection, guilt, disappointment, shame, or resentment which he is experiencing in relation to his own parents. Or he may still be clinging to one or both of his parents, unwilling to give up. He is unable to give the warm response which foster parents might expect. For this child the institution provides a situation away from all relatives. It gives him an emotional rest and an opportunity to look at his parents a little more objectively. The court which is determining custody receives an evaluation of the child's reactions to his parents from the standpoint of a neutral environment. Usually, in these situations, arrangements are made for the mother and father to visit or take the children out on alternate Sundays. The institution staff has an opportunity to observe reactions to each parent and to help determine with which one the child feels the greatest security. The institution with a stimulating program of activities offers new interests to the child who may have been completely absorbed by the parental situation. He becomes interested in group or individual play which diverts his thoughts away from the worry over his home situation to channels of physical activity.

Institutional care has also been found to be helpful for children who have failed in a number of boarding home placements. Often such children have experienced great insecurity in relationship to their own family situations before placement, and have never been able to find satisfactions in foster homes. They

may have lost confidence and trust in adults, and if this is the case, they are usually aggressive and negativistic. When the institution gives them an opportunity to express their hostility, either verbally or through play, or both; when they are kept and loved in spite of their behavior; when they begin to find some satisfactions in their day-by-day life, accept adults as friends, experience success, build up some values of their own, go along on an even keel for a while—then the chances for success in the next foster home placement are better. These children are more receptive and responsive when some of the control for their behavior comes from the group rather than exclusively from adults.

The child who has failed at home, at school and in his community has also been helped by a period in the institution. Sometimes such a child has both parents, or an own and a step-parent. Perhaps he has brothers and sisters who are successful and more acceptable to the parents than he. He may be the one rejected child in the family, or perhaps he is the one who is unable to stand certain strains, stresses or problems in the home, or in the parental relationship. A foster home is, for him, too near his own situation. It is possible too that he might identify one or both of the foster parents with his own. He is more comfortable with cottage parents who have been trained to be objective in their relationships to the children and their relatives, and to understand and accept the aggressive behavior which children coming from this kind of home situation sometimes feel a need to bring out, for a period at least. It is possible, as part of the institution program, to offer a wide gamut of physical activities—from boxing, punching the punching bag, bicycle riding, skating, baseball, swimming—down to the milder sled riding, ping-pong, airplane making, and table games. From these activities the child can choose those which appeal to him and which afford a satisfying, acceptable and directed outlet for the drive for action which he may have as a result of his emotional conflict. The rejected child who comes to the institution from his own home often shows a determination to go back to the same situation from which he came. The institution may be able to give him a lift which makes it possible for him to return to his own home and to make a more satisfactory adjustment there.

Sometimes the case worker can help the parents gain insight into their feelings for the child and to show more tolerance in their acceptance of him. The child becomes more attractive to his parents when they see the interest the institution staff shows in him, and when they observe the child's responsive-

ness to approval and recognition. Perhaps the institution discovers some latent ability or talent and helps the child develop it. Not only do the parents gain in understanding, but the child himself grows in self-respect. In learning to swim, to ride a bicycle, to dance, model clay, paint, read—in being helpful and receiving a positive response all along the way—he develops some strengths and satisfactions within himself. The child's status within the family improves but he has less need for his family's approval, since he is more self-sufficient. Both he and his parents may grow to feel that he wasn't so bad after all.

In contrast to the above situation, there is the child who has one good stable parent with whom he has real security. For him, institutional care is also sometimes an acceptable plan. It may be useful as a sort of boarding school arrangement to a working mother who is divorced or widowed, and has assumed the responsibility for the entire support of one or more children. She may have a deep and genuine love for her children, and may be unwilling to share them with a foster mother. For the children, their mother is enough. Theirs is a little family unit, complete and satisfactory to them. Occasionally a father whose wife has died cannot accept, as yet, a foster mother or visiting housekeeper. For him, too, an institution is one answer.

Sometimes the institution is asked to care for a very deprived child of four, five, or six, who seems most in need of foster home care, but cannot take it. Children who have not had secure years during babyhood or early childhood, or those who may have had a satisfactory home situation broken off suddenly and in a way shocking to them at two or three, are sometimes unable to make a good adjustment in a foster home. They may want more constant and undivided attention and affection from a foster mother than she is able to give. Never having had their fill of affection at one, or two, or three years, they constantly seek and clamor for it. Or, they may never have learned to love and to be loved. Some of these children can only take, not give, and a foster mother naturally expects response. Her own need for a responsive child may have prompted her to board children.

Some children deprived in early childhood push off all overtures of affection and are quite negativistic. They do all they can to try the patience of a foster mother. Often too much is expected of them by way of performance, even in a simple foster home. If placed in a home with another child, they may be constantly jealous and quarrelsome. If the institution housemother can accept all the trying behavior

without expecting response and improvement too quickly, if she can patiently teach the child how to be loved and to love, and how to share with other children, then the institution can make a contribution to the child's personal adjustment. The assistance of the psychiatrist is needed here, as in many other situations, to help diagnose unusual behavior and responses, and to guide the staff in treatment and in planning for the child after he leaves the institution.

Some children come to the institution for a period previous to foster home placement to have the rough edges smoothed off. Due to physical and emotional neglect, their appearance, lack of training and habits, their responses, may be such as to make them unacceptable to foster parents at the time of placement. In the institution, with its many facilities right at hand, it is possible to do a rather intensive job in medical and dental care, nutrition, habit training, care of clothing, table manners, and social relationships. All of these services increase the chances for a successful foster home placement.

It is difficult to find one foster home, or two nearby foster homes, which can absorb, sometimes on an emergency basis, four, five or six children. This is possible in an institution. Many large motherless families are now assisted by family agencies which, in providing visiting housekeepers, case work service and material relief, help prevent the breakup of homes. However, there are situations in which the family may be broken up at the time of referral, or where the one remaining parent is ill or away from home, when placement care may be necessary until the home can be re-established.

Occasionally, institutional care is the answer for children who need the socializing effects of group life. Some who have developed no inner resources and little sense of self-direction respond positively to a planned program, to strong direction, and to give and take with other children.

Sometimes, too, a child is referred for a period of study and observation. Perhaps little is known about what kind of a child he really is, and how his needs can best be met. The institution case worker and the other members of the staff gain an understanding of the individual, not only in their direct work with him, but in observing his relationships to other children, his relatives and other adults. The staff sees how he meets all sorts of situations. The case worker or the referring agency may be planning for his care after his needs are more clearly defined. The house staff keeps the case worker informed as to the child's progress and his reactions. The small interesting bits of information and incidents she hears and observes

about each child are as helpful to her as the more formal conferences with houseparents and the periodic evaluations made of the child's reactions, adjustment and progress at staff meetings. In the small institutional setting all of these experiences crystallize themselves into a pattern which gives a fairly complete picture of the child and his needs.

The institution can be useful to a child between foster home placements, when replacement is necessary because of a change in the foster home itself or due to the child's inability to make a satisfactory adjustment. It is sometimes easier for the child who is leaving one home to have a period in an institution or in a camp before going into another home. The chances for adjustment in a second foster home may be better if the child is not expected to relate himself so quickly to a new home and to new foster parents.

The Week End and Holiday Use of Foster Homes for Children in the Institution

It is helpful to the agency having both an institution and a foster home program to be able to use some of its foster homes for week end or holiday care for children needing a break away from the group. Even when the institution situation is favorable, when intake is carefully worked out, when children are not kept too long, and when the population is small—even then—group life may become tiring. The rising bell rings at the same time every morning, there is a certain necessary routine and tempo, there are always people around and usually movement and activity. The child's stay in the institution has more value if he can break away from this routine occasionally and have a change. The week end foster home can also be used for the child who has no relatives to visit or for the one who needs convalescent care. Of the various foster homes used by the agency, it is possible to choose and develop one or two which have some particular value as a week end or vacation home. For the city institution, whose children come from urban areas, a farm home may be the answer. Not only is there a change away from the group, but the farm offers new experiences and interests. For the child for whom foster home placement is planned, a week end in the home used regularly by the agency for this purpose gives some clue as to his possible reactions in a regular foster home. The city institution may find the farm home useful too, instead of a camp vacation, particularly for younger children. Camping is another group experience, whereas a foster home vacation offers a complete change. For the country institution, the city foster home might be

used for week end visiting, introducing the child to some of the things he misses in the country—the zoo, library, art gallery, railroad station, and bus rides.

What are Some of the Points Which Determine Transfer from the Institution to a Foster Home?

The length of time during which children are kept in the institution varies greatly with the individual. In general, three years is thought of as the longest time that any child should stay in the institution. Some children, however, are ready for foster home placement after a few months. The important consideration is that the staff should be aware of and sensitive to the signs which indicate when the institution has made its maximum contribution, and when the child is ready to move on to another type of care, return to his own, or to a foster home. In the small institution which has a lively turnover the largest number of children in the total population at any time are those in their first year. It is during their first and second years that children are most responsive to the new environment and new interests, and it is then that they make their greatest progress—progress that follows the stimulation of the new activities and experiences offered. As a result, there develops a spontaneous group spirit and response which sets a quick pace and lively tempo. The new child is caught up and swept along in this current of activity and spirit of enthusiasm, and of his own accord drops some of his old patterns of less acceptable behavior. Children are usually apt to want to identify with others of their same age group and to be like them. The new child is eager to be accepted by the others. He takes his cue from them and often goes along, without resistance, in the same direction the group is going. This is one of the positive values in group care when group response is good. Many of the children enjoy a repetition of the first year's program during the second year and anticipate eagerly each seasonal activity. It is usually during the second and third years that the child who stays that long shows signs which indicate that he is ready for another type of care. Some of these signs are: lack of response, reaching out and being able to make deeper emotional ties, a greater acceptance of and ability to adjust to an own home or foster home, too great dependence on the institution and liking it there too well, and fatigue due to continual group care. Also to be considered when determining the length of stay are the child's age, his own personal tempo, his experiences before admission, the status of his family situation, whether or not he has made progress and

is continuing to do so, his ability to meet and adapt to new situations, and, finally, the degree to which he is acceptable to his own relatives or to foster parents in a way satisfying to him.

In addition to the time element, the situation of the individual is taken into consideration in the length of time a child remains in the institution. The child with a good dependable parent can usually respond to a longer period of care than the child from a more complicated and upset home. Of the institution population, it is the children of stable, responsible parents who accept placement most readily and who go along on a fairly even keel. There is security and comfort for them in the fact that every Sunday, sometimes every week end, is spent with the parent; that it is their father or mother who takes them shopping for clothing; and that eventually that parent will re-establish a home for them. Even one day a week at home, and even when that home is the parent's furnished room, keeps them in touch with the real situations of family life. A day or two a week away from the institution affords a regular relief from the tensions of group living and means that the group living has greater value over a period of time.

With the very upset child, the length of stay is necessarily indefinite. He may have had a number of failures in his own or foster homes, is hostile as a result, and has usually lost confidence in adults. He may feel that he is pretty much alone in the world, and that everyone is against him. One of the positive elements in an institution is that the staff offers a number of personalities to all of whom the child is more or less related. In addition to his own houseparent, there are other houseparents, his case worker, the volunteer, board member, superintendent, the cook. Among all of these people, there is usually someone to whom the child begins to respond. He gradually begins to feel that he can trust one adult, and as his security with this one increases, he may be able, gradually, to take on several others. When this happens, he becomes more relaxed and secure in general. He sees other children who are in the same situation he is in, and that is some comfort to him. When his capacity for social relationships develops to the point where it is felt he might accept foster parents, placement in a home is planned for him.

The following cases illustrate how the length of time spent in the institution differs in individual situations:

Jane and Helen were referred by the Juvenile Court. The father had deserted, and the children were neglected by the mother. Unsuccessful attempts had been made to improve home conditions over a period of years by a number of case working agencies, including the family agency which partici-

pated in referring the children for placement. Jane and Helen were in great need of affection and mothering and were ready to make ties with foster parents. After two months in the institution they were placed in a foster home together under the care of the agency.

Bill, only child of a divorced and employed mother came to the agency upon the mother's application. He had been running wild and without supervision while the mother worked. He was an outgoing, overactive boy, intensely interested in group activities. He needed much direction and a full and active program. The group setting met his needs at the time of placement, and he made a good response for a period of two years and nine months, after which he was placed in a foster home under the supervision of the institution's case worker.

Allen, seven, was the youngest of six motherless children. The father was unemployed at the time of referral to the institution by a family agency. There was no home or furniture and nothing for the family society to work on toward establishing the family on a visiting housekeeping basis. The plan as anticipated by the father, the children, the family agency and the institution was for the children to have a period of care in the Home pending the father's re-employment and remarriage. Family ties were close and strong, indicating placement of all six children together in a situation where they could see their father frequently. A good deal of physical corrective work was necessary, for the children had been on a substandard diet for some time. A high caloric diet, posture correction, dental repair, removal of tonsils and adenoids, training and play, were all possible on a rather intensive basis in the institution. The father found employment, paid for part of the children's board, and began to save for household furnishings. His marriage occurred two and one-half years after the children's admission, and the home was re-established three years from the time the children came to the institution. Knowing that they were going home, the five older children responded to care and to activities until they left. Allen, the youngest, indicated, after two and one-half years, a need for more than the institution could offer at that point. He was beginning to show signs of fatigue as a result of over two years of group care and group activities, and the staff felt he needed to be in a foster home for the six months preceding his return to his own home. Individual children in a family react differently to the same set of family or placement circumstances, and the need of the individual should be the determining factor in the plans made for him.

In the transfer from the institution to a foster home, the child's age needs also to be considered. Children of twelve, thirteen or fourteen, who are just completing grade school, are more ready to accept foster home placement, and make easier adjustments to it than those whose placement is delayed until the ages of fifteen or sixteen. Foster parents are usually more interested in boarding children younger than those of adolescent age. It is often possible to place a child before he is ready to enter high school, in a home in which he stays until he is graduated. When they take a pre-adolescent child and become attached to him, foster parents become fond enough of him to struggle with him through the ups and downs of adolescence through his high school career. On the other hand, a boy or girl of sixteen or seventeen, who is pretty well established in his own pattern, is not so adaptable to a foster home, and he resists attempts to redirect him. The foster home affords a more normal and independent way of living for high school children than does the institution.

What Part do the Children and Their Parents Play in the Transfer from One Type of Care to Another?

From the time that application is made for the child's admission to the institution, the relatives are carried along in all of the plans made for him. The agency asks the parent to make his own application even when the court has custody of the child and complete or partial control of a situation, and even when all the arrangements for admission may have been made by the court, clinic, or other social agencies with the institution's case worker. The parent and child accept placement and subsequent care more readily when they have visited the institution during the course of the intake study and when both feel that the admission of the child is the result of the parent's application and the child's participation and not only the planning of the social agencies and the courts who are interested in the case.

The plan for the child after he leaves, the goal toward which the institution is working, is kept in mind from the time the intake study is made and during the entire period of care. Usually at the time of admission the agency sets a tentative time limitation and has in mind a possible ultimate plan. This may be a foster home placement after an interval in the institution; it may be the home of a relative after a period of study and observation both of the home and the child; it may be return to the child's own home. The discharge process, like the intake process, is one which is carefully worked out over a period of time and with the co-operation and participation of the parent, the child, the referring agency, often the court, the child guidance clinic, and the institution staff and case worker.

The suggestion for transfer to a foster home from the institution almost always comes from the agency rather than the child's relatives. When parents have built up a feeling of confidence in the institution, they are often reluctant to make a change. They hesitate to take the chance of disturbing what to them seems to be a satisfactory arrangement, and to adjust to another set of circumstances. The security and regularity of the institution are satisfying to some parents, and often meet their needs to a greater degree than they do the needs of their children. There sometimes develops a reluctance and a delay in reassuming the care of a family or in adjusting to the idea of foster home care. The institution staff can help keep alive a feeling of responsibility on the part of many parents

and can avoid the development of too great a dependence on the agency by frequent conferences with the parent regarding the child's progress. It is necessary for the institution case worker to interpret to the parent, often over a period of months, why the child is ready for another type of care. The fact that the children in foster homes return to the institution for medical and dental care, and that the institution case worker visits them in their foster homes, gives some reassurance to the parents.

It is easier to prepare children for placement than to prepare their parents. The friends of the children in the Home who have gone into foster homes, and their foster parents, are in and out of the institution. The children learn to know the foster parents, and thus the foster home idea loses some of its strangeness. Parents usually accept the foster home after they visit it and are so able to visualize it in terms of a real situation. The child's pre-placement visit to the home, his willingness to stay, the expression of his desire and enthusiasm to his parent, all help to sell the idea.

The placement plan in which the child has a part is more acceptable to him than one which he might have felt was made all around him without taking him into direct consideration. When the case worker finds a home for the child who is ready for placement, several preliminary visits to the foster home are arranged. The foster parents are certain, then, that they want to have this child come for a longer period, and the institution staff learns, too, whether the child would like to go to this home to stay. When he goes to the foster home with all of his clothing and personal possessions, it is to a known rather than to an unknown place.

Thus, the change from one kind of care to another—placement from the institution to a foster home, or from a foster home to the institution—requires a careful sense of timing, a thoughtful preparation of the child and his relatives for the change, an understanding of what the child needs at a certain point; and the skill of a case worker who, in her planning, carries the child, the child's own family, the institution staff and the foster parents along with her. The flexible use of the foster home and institution by the same agency, or by two agencies working closely together and realizing the strengths and the limitations of both kinds of care, makes a wider range of services available to children.

Stop and Go Signs in Child Protection

E. MARGUERITE GANE

MRS. BERTHA DAMON, who wrote "Grandma Called It Carnal," tells of two old men who went to a lecture. After listening intently for about fifteen minutes, one, slightly deaf, turned to the other and said, "What's he talking about?" The other cocked his ear for two or three minutes before replying, "He don't say."

In order that you may not be thus embarrassed, I am going to tell you what I propose to talk about. It will be about the function of a protective agency, how that function changes as community conditions shift, and finally, how that function may be implemented by professional service, particularly in this time of war.

Why Social Work

The words "social work" bring to the mind of the average person two simple images, trouble and help. Some folks may go beyond and be able to distinguish between the family agency, the child-placing agency, and the protective society, or even have a vague notion of the meaning of "intake," "therapeutic interviews," or "dynamic relationships." Agency programs may be divided on a functional basis, or on a district, a sectarian, or a financial one. I am not much concerned about jurisdictional disputes or traditional competition, provided the people who need the service get the best quality of service adapted to their particular needs. There certainly would be enough trouble to go around even if we multiplied our services several times.

On the other hand, I do not think that functional divisions in social work are meaningless; nor do I discount the values of specialization. Although agencies did not get set up originally as a result of social planning in its modern sense, neither did they evolve from the shot-gun weddings that seem to be so popular in our own day of surveys. One basic element was, and still is, an important factor in every program. That is, a genuine concern about people's troubles and a directed effort to help them, usually an effort which takes a great deal of imagination, initiative and courage. Sixty years ago these instigators or pioneers were laymen. In 1942 the leadership still has to be assumed and carried by the laymen, people permanently and deeply entrenched in the community in positions of trust and influence. The best staffed agency in the world cannot be effective without this kind of board leadership.

One of the earliest forms of organization to help children was the protective or humane society. Its purpose remains today what it was 60 years ago, the protection of children from harm, but what that harm consists of is a very different story in different periods. Problems change, there are shifts in emphasis in every phase of community life. Organized help also changes, from protection to prevention, from punishment to persuasion, from authority to analysis, whether this help be in the legal, medical or social field. The attitude of the social worker toward human beings has become one of increased respect for human beings, as psychology has thrown more light upon the meaning of behavior, personality and its relationship to environment.

Thus, "self-determinism," "freedom," "democracy in case work," are phrases we hear today, indicating new attitudes toward the client which are the basis for a different kind of practice radically affecting the tempo of work, the social worker's own relationship to the agency and to the client, and the quality of results.

Case Work in the Protective Services

It is unfortunate but true that social agencies over a period of years tend to become characterized by their methods rather than by their functions. This is the reason why many protective societies have missed the boat, have come to be regarded not as social agencies at all, but as enforcement agencies set apart as necessarily authoritative. This is due to the fact that they have relied almost entirely on legal methods in trying to reach their objectives, and in trying to protect children have limited their services to the investigation of complaints, dictatorial methods of dealing with parents and prosecution of offenders, sort of a "stick your foot in the door and grab the child" philosophy, which has not been too well accepted by the rugged American individualist who happens to be reported to the agency by his rugged American neighbor.

If, as case work methods began to take shape in our training schools of social work, protective societies had flirted with them a little instead of being threatened by them, case work itself would have benefited, as well as the clients in protective agencies. Instead, as case work began to grow strong, private family and child-placing agencies grabbed an option on it. This led to a growing breach between

these agencies and their "siblings," the institutions and the protective societies. I do believe that we have a greater responsibility to see clearly the problem of the application of case work to the field of protection, which is general in this field, so general that even schools of social work and legislative groups and councils of social agencies are in possession of great ignorance and misconceptions about it. Sometimes we feel like Teddy, who asked his mother to buy him scented soap so she could be sure to know when he had washed.

If only to discharge their responsibility to the founders, laymen should become more vocal about the extent to which children are suffering from harm and strain and conflicts within their homes and should insist that every special skill that anyone has acquired be extended to aid these children and their families to keep from "going under." Especially on the home front of a warring nation, does this become imperative.

Social work has never been in as good a position to offer help as it is today. It has drunk at the fountains of psychology and psychiatry and other potent dispensaries. It is intrinsically different from its former state. It is no longer based on the philosophy of the strong helping the weak, or the rich sharing with the poor, or the good rescuing the bad. After all, this growth of the case work method is unique to America, where democracy and mutual respect are preferred to paternalism and benevolence. Case work is based upon respect for every human being, upon faith in a man's capacity for self-help and upon the desire to offer to the person in trouble a professional, not personal, service based upon an understanding of his difficulties and of his needs.

This professional service, case work, is not a simple system of methods, applicable to all comers, but is a body of scientific knowledge acquired through study in schools of social work, internship in agencies, and, most important of all, and as in all professions, through a rigid self-discipline.

Training for Case Work

I would like to say a few more words about what this case work training consists of. There are some basic concepts. In a recently published book* some of these concepts are discussed under such captions as "The Concept of Ambivalence," which explains that the desire to do something, to act in a given way, frequently has its counterpart in an equally strong desire not to act in that way, resulting in conflict and

* "Basic Concepts in Social Case Work," Herbert H. Aptekar, University of North Carolina Press, 1941.

indecision. In another chapter the author discusses the effects of the coming together of the clients' and the workers' wills, and movement in the right direction which may come from this.

A third chapter describes "Relationships" and the professional use of the interview. Most change is brought about through interviews, and so it becomes very important that, to quote Mr. Aptekar, "the client partakes during interviews of some of the characteristics of ordinary friendship and still it is different since it is a professional relationship, with definite limitations, usually set by the function of the agency. Discussion of the client's feelings fills a large part of the interviewing time."

Because relationship is so all important in any case work service, I want to ask you not to forget that this is the professionalizing of the early friendly visitor idea; retaining its integrity but endowing it with a more purposeful method, and promoting it to a more democratic level.

Use of Authority

One may ask, if the protective agency does not use authority, how can it go into a home uninvited and remain, the unwanted? Mr. Vernon, of our staff, discusses this in a recent paper entitled "Significant Elements in the Beginning Relationship Between the Worker and Client of the Protective Agency." He says: "The personal factor in this relationship is the most vital element. Where is this first set in play where the agency has to make the first move? The worker is asked, by a concerned member of the community, to go into a situation where a parent has got 'out of tune' with life, where he can no longer manage his situation in a healthy way for himself and for his child and thereby is affecting his child in a way that is believed harmful to the child's growth and development." The case worker gives the parent the opportunity to participate in this relationship from the beginning by writing to him, to inform him that a report has come to the agency about his trouble, telling him that it has special help to offer in connection with such problems and offering him an appointment for an office or a home visit. This gives the parent a choice, to come or not to come, an opportunity to strike out at us if he wishes; certainly it puts it up to him as a parent with rights and a part to play, and what we have to give is offered him on a business-like basis. The parent usually comes to the office. The case worker, to quote Mr. Vernon again, "must be free from prejudice and from a preconceived negative attitude toward the parent," but he must bring to the situation feelings of sympathy for a

person in trouble, understanding of the parent's resentment toward others for discovering his plight, respect for the parent's individuality as an equal member of the community, who, in his own way, must determine how he wants to work out his problem. There will be enough feeling on the parent's part that the case worker may represent an inquisitive, authoritative, powerful agent there to punish him, to deprive him of what positive strength he has left, without the case worker needing to exert any authoritative manner. This problem is challenging to the skill of the worker and his "self-discipline," but I can state, from many years' experience in the field, that it gets greater results than does the authoritative, aggressive approach.

"Almost no parent really wants to neglect or abuse his child." He may be growing distraught over a too long period of unemployment. His problem may be one of marital disturbance, a fear or likelihood that his spouse will break off a relationship which has meant so much to him, or he may be the one wishing to be free and feels caught in his responsibilities and overwhelmed by his conflicting feelings about them. "He takes it out" on his children, often unconsciously or not knowing why he does it. The worker's job is to "provide a relationship that makes it possible for the parent to have an opportunity to recognize his feelings and attitudes about his problem." To be helpful is to release the parent enough that he can begin again and move forward in steps of planning wisely and constructively for himself and his child. His "bad" feelings gradually loosen their hold upon him and he becomes more comfortable and self-respecting. As he becomes more comfortable and more secure in his goodness, the change in himself gradually effects change in all his relationships, particularly those with his home.

This type of service is just as effective all the way through the contacts as in the beginning. It also stands up in the use of the courts. It is not true that a worker discards case work and takes on authority when he takes a family to court. The function of the court, too, is a constructive one. It offers to the client a judicial review of the worker's experiences with the family as well as the situation of the family itself. It often offers to an overburdened parent who cannot force himself to take responsibility a good deal of relief through the judge's making up his mind for him. Others, as frequently in the case of adolescents, need to have definite limits set within which they can seem to function more easily.

While some private agencies were cooperating in the development of the use of these newer case work

techniques, most protective societies remained off in their own corners, feeling it easier to warn, threaten, punish or rescue. Because of this, today we find ourselves handicapped. We have waked up to the fact that the troubles of our clients are different in degree, not in kind, from those whose problems can be met by family and child-placing agencies, but that those agencies, since the depression, have become more and more selective in the persons to whom they offer case work help. They have confined their services mostly to clients who recognize a need for help and are to some degree psychologically or emotionally ready to accept it from the agency.

Where does that leave us? While other case workers say we will serve only those who come voluntarily, we have on our doorsteps the complained against, the hostile, resistant parents who feel terribly threatened by being reported to us as failing parents. Curiously enough, this situation has been as terrifying to the trained worker as to the parent, and both have been equally resistant, one to the other. Our clients are the children. Yet, if we could help their parents with the same kind of professional service that parents get from other case work organizations, might we not improve family life to the point where children's troubles would be solved?

One of our best trained workers who came to us from the family field reports: "It is interesting to me that my most intensive treatment cases at the present time are those which originally had been complaint cases and I feel that, by interpreting our function carefully, and working through their original hostility and resistance, a new level of understanding was reached and the client seemed more receptive to case work treatment."

Another factor which should be stressed in the protective field is the importance of getting into cases at an earlier state. We are having some success with an experiment whereby school principals, instead of referring cases to us, try to explain to the parents of the children whom they think need help that there is an agency with a particular kind of service which will be of help to them if they would apply for it; or if this is too much to ask, if they would be willing for the school to call us in. The Children's Court also recognizes this principle and changes many complaints of juvenile delinquency to parental neglect or insufficient guardianship, thus placing the responsibility on the adults and not upon the child in those cases where circumstances surrounding the child coerce him into delinquency. Gradually, folks in the community are learning not to use us as a threat, but, instead, as a helpful resource.

Why the War Increased Need for Social Services

So much for some of the things which go into protective service. What about the effect of the war on our agencies? Miss Charlotte Whitton, of Canada, said:

"After every possible man goes to war, 90 per cent of our people will remain in the home line and any threat to this home line is a threat to the fighting forces and to our country after the war." In Canada, 13 per cent of men between 20 and 60 are drawn into service; half of the remainder are in defense industries. "Unemployables" are being trained carefully and fitted into special places where they can fit and produce. Women are spending more hours in the home and releasing able-bodied domestic helpers to industry. Child protective problems have increased. Young people earning wages refuse to spend leisure hours in poor and overcrowded homes and are filling the "joints." England tried to replace young men in protective agencies with the older and physically unfit worker, finding, much to their sorrow, that an immediate increase in juvenile delinquency took place. As in Canada, the greatest shift is shown in the decreasing cost of dependency and the increasing number of problems which need case work.

In Buffalo we find our job is not with the poor but with the poor in heart and the sick in soul or mind. In 1938, 40 per cent of our clients were on relief. Today 8 per cent are. The three-shift day in vogue with us means fathers sleeping in the daytime, the children sent out to stay out until he awakens. It gives mother ample opportunity to tuck the children in bed and to go to the taverns to help the many single newcomers spend their high earnings while father is working on the night shift. Child labor violations have trebled during the last few months.

Younger boys and girls find it easier to lie about their age and take the places of older youth as ushers, waitresses, entertainers, or setting up pins in bowling alleys.

Both parents are working as defense industries are opening their doors to women. Defense hits us and our clientele and is not a thing separate from the agencies. Councils of Social Agencies and City Defense Councils must work together.

Will the demand for releasing the school children to harvest the crops pull down all our bitterly fought-for standards of child protection, or can we cooperate by releasing the older children—and there are plenty—on condition that they have medical examinations, decent living conditions, and a fair wage?

Now that the fathers are working, shall we change the hours of our agency to make our services available during certain evenings? Will the Children's Court do likewise? What about our families who have a static income, barely enough to make a level of decency, now that the cost of living has gone up? Will mother have to go to work?

Conclusion

Defense is not around the corner, it is on our doorstep. Trained workers are scarce as hens' teeth and are being induced away from us by higher salaries. Board members who cut agency meetings to go to committees of temporary need may find themselves failing their agencies when the need is greatest therein. We must not spread ourselves thin while our own families are experiencing their troubles during the nation's greatest crisis and need more concentrated service than ever. Our clients are the social barometer. If we keep close to them, we will understand and better serve all people in the community.

The Agency's Part in Helping Adolescents to Assume Responsibility

MADELEINE MARIS

AN agency which receives for foster care only very young children has a double responsibility for its adolescents. It is responsible for the living situation in which the child has grown up, and out of which he has gained whatever ability he has to meet the problems which confront him at this stage of his development. It is also responsible for making its program of care for adolescents a continuation of the process started when the child came into care, that is,

of helping the child use placement for the realization of his own potentialities.

Since the Children's Bureau of Philadelphia, which I represent, accepts for placement only children under two years of age, all our adolescents have grown up in foster homes; so we cannot derive any comfort from the fact that their problems at this period have their roots in previous experience. We have provided the setting for that experience and, unless we have

helped each child to attain for himself a secure position before he reaches the critical stage of adolescence, he is poorly equipped to take on new responsibility at this time. The child who has achieved a place of his own in relation to own parents, to foster parents, and to agency, has a stable base which helps him weather the storms of adolescence. At this point, however, there are many new problems in foster care with which he needs our continued help. Much of the agency's procedure takes on new meaning for the child beginning to grow up, and his response changes accordingly. During adolescence there are also new problems for the child around his relationship with his own parents and with his foster parents.

Every child who stays on in a foster home until the time when the agency's care stops must meet whatever problems that brings. Much of the adolescent foster child's struggle in growing up centers around the question of what the agency can do for him as the time for leaving care approaches.

Our agency finds public support for its children, stopping, in most cases, at sixteen, but the law requires that children stay in school until eighteen unless they can secure jobs before that time. We cannot continue full board throughout this two-year period. We pay a reduced rate during the school year, with the child and the foster parents working out arrangements for the summer months, which usually means that the child pays some board during this time. We also continue clothing for the child, allowing the same annual budget as for children of twelve to sixteen, the child planning its use with the worker. This allowance of \$36 a year makes it necessary for these older children to find some means of supplementing it if they are to be adequately clothed. Most children do this from their own earnings.

I should like to present in summary form what happened in the case work contacts with one adolescent girl over a two-year period while she was struggling with the problem of beginning to assume responsibility for herself. Mary has been in the care of the agency since she was a small child, and is well established in the foster home where she has lived for over five years. Her father and mother have been divorced and each has married again. Mary's younger sister lives in the same foster home, and both sets of parents visit the children.

A few months after Mary was fourteen, clothing became a pressing problem. She began to be more conscious of clothes, pored over fashion magazines and planned what she would like to have in her own wardrobe. She had good ideas about design and color and excellent taste in the things she liked, but was pretty visionary in what she expected the agency to do for her. When it came time for spring shopping, the case worker talked with Mary and her foster mother about the

amount of money which could be allowed for her clothing. She suggested that Mary think about what she needed in terms of this sum; while the agency had this amount to spend, they must be sure that the clothing purchased would meet her needs for the season. A short time later the worker talked again with Mary who had very definite ideas about what she wanted—a robin's-egg blue suit, a burgundy hat and shoes. In the discussion that followed it seemed that what she really needed most was a coat. The worker therefore questioned the wisdom of getting a suit, and felt too that while the colors Mary had selected were attractive, the agency could not get her things so perishable. Mary was mad about this and said if she couldn't have what she wanted, she wouldn't get any clothes. She didn't like to figure out "old budgets" anyway. She wished she could just go in town and buy things when she needed them. The worker expressed the agency's desire to get for Mary the clothes she needed, but there were restrictions on the kind of things they could buy. A time was set to go shopping with Mary and her sister. Mary could come or not as she liked, but, unless she were willing to consider something different from the kind of outfit she had described, there was not much point in her coming. Mary was angry, and the worker was not at all sure she would want the kind of clothing that it was possible for the agency to get.

However, Mary came with her sister for the shopping expedition and, to the visitor's surprise, she was bubbling over with enthusiasm. She announced that she would like to get her coat first of all; she had decided that was the best thing to do. She and the worker talked a bit about the suit she had wanted, and Mary commented that she had moods like that when she didn't like anything she could have, and then added that she was "difficult" at times. The worker felt everyone had to have a chance to express his feeling about things that were hard. Mary got her coat, hat and shoes, and was happy over the purchases.

A short time later she asked for silk stockings, and the worker went over the clothing budget with her. Considering the other things she would need during the year, it was plain that the budget would not stand the strain of silk stockings. The worker suggested that this was something Mary might provide for herself, and the possibilities of earning money were discussed. Mary was sure there was no way she could do this, but the worker felt she would have to see what she could do since the clothing allowance could not be changed.

A few months before her sixteenth birthday the worker talked with her about the change of plan which would be necessary then. The foster mother was willing to keep her for the low rate of board which the agency could pay during the school year, but Mary was alarmed to learn that no board could be paid during summer vacations. She was sure she could not get a summer job and rejected all suggestions. The worker realized it was hard, but thought it was something Mary would have to work on. This discussion was painful to the child; she was fearful and disturbed. When the worker recognized this, Mary made the comment that she would "just like to forget it and go on living." The worker agreed that it was unpleasant to face this necessity, but the reason she brought it up was that she thought the agency might be able to help her work out some of these things if they started working on them with her before she got to be sixteen. Mary spoke of her feeling for her foster family, and her desire to stay on with them.

A few months later there was another shopping expedition, but there were no painful scenes over this one. Mary had planned carefully what she would need and could get on her allowance, using some things which her mother had given her a short time before. She herself suggested that she must get a hat and shoes which would last her through the season. She had made all the plans most responsibly, and reflected on how much she had changed.

During the preceding months Mary had been working, caring for children in the evenings, using the money she earned to supplement her clothing allowance and to meet special expenses at school. During the spring of this year a new problem arose: Mary's mother decided to request that the children be returned to her. The children did not want to go because of the difficulties they had found in living with her when their mother had taken them home a few years ago. Their father had been paying a support order, but his obliga-

tion to pay for Mary would stop when she was sixteen. The agency did not feel it could assume for Mary even the customary low rate of board for older children when the parents were able to meet this expense. However, when Mary expressed her keen desire to stay in the foster home, her father volunteered to pay privately to the agency for her care after public support stopped, and the mother withdrew her request for the children's return.

This girl, who was sixteen last fall, has continued in school this year, earning enough out of school hours to take care of her expenses above what the agency is able to do. She has achieved real growth in meeting her own particular problems in assuming responsibility. Also, the decision to remain in care instead of going to live with her mother made placement very much her own plan. She has found it hard to accept restrictions on clothing and the necessity to work, but the give and take of her discussion with the worker, together with the definite understanding of what the agency could do, helped her to accept it.

The Agency's Responsibility

The agency's part in helping adolescents, as shown in the case of Mary, seems to me only the expression, at a particular point in the child's development, of the agency's responsibility for helping foster children all through the placement period. Our obligation to the child we place is to help him use this experience constructively if he can. For some children this is impossible, but I take it for granted that we are discussing here the child who finds in foster care an experience he can accept, assuming that our responsibility for the service we offer would not permit us to continue the care of the child who cannot use that help. What the foster child needs in day to day living changes as he grows, but our responsibility remains the same—to make our service so strong and sure in structure and so sensitive in operation that it will help the child to find his own strength for the problems that growth brings. The child who comes to adolescence in a foster home faces the necessity of leaving placement and becoming independent. This is just one of the foster child's problems in growing up, and our concern is to help him find within himself the resources to meet it. Our helpfulness here grows out of our ability to define and maintain, all through our program of foster care, the agency's part in relation to the children it places.

We lay the foundation for the child's use of foster care by making our service one he can grasp without being overwhelmed by its total nature of change. The warm quality of the agency's concern for the children it places is expressed, first of all, in basing its structure on the child's need to engage himself in this new experience a step at a time, feeling his way along as he goes to the agency's office, attends clinic, helps select new clothes, enters a foster home and finds his own way of living in this new set-up. He has a part in every step, a chance to find out what it offers, to choose whether this is something he wants.

The worker who carries out this process with the child embodies the purpose of the agency responsible for his care, but her sensitive regard of the child as a person assures him the right to determine just how and to what extent he will participate in the plan. Her conviction of the rightness and the necessity of the steps which the agency has formulated gives her ease and sureness in presenting them, and in living through them with the child. Through the worker, identified with the agency's function and its way of working, the child gets a sense of the agency as an institution strong enough to care for him, and human enough to guarantee him security in his status as a foster child.

As the child takes his place in a foster home, his growth depends on the consistency with which we maintain a responsible program for his care, at the same time according him room to take hold of it in his own way.

The Parents' and Foster Parents' Responsibility

In emphasizing the relationship between agency and child, I do not mean to minimize the importance of the part which own parents and foster parents have in the process. We know that, for the child whose parents preserve an active tie to him, placement can offer nothing he can use unless the parents participate with the agency in the plan. We know, too, that, in working with the agency on a child's care, parents can find real help for the problem of their troubled relationship to a child. The result may be a closer tie or it may be a complete separation, but, if this working together of parents and agency leads to a plan for long-time foster care, the parents' decision on this course leaves the child more free to accept it for himself. And through the help that placement offers both parent and child, each for his own development, they grow in relation to each other, if not more closely aligned, at least better able to accept the relationship which is possible between them.

On the foster home itself depends much of the effectiveness of our service to children. That service does not consist solely of the homes we offer, for we do not delegate to foster parents the final responsibility for children. However, we cannot overestimate the vital part played by foster parents who offer loving and dependable care and, at the same time, allow the child some choice in the way he relates himself to them. Such foster parents make it possible for the child to find a means of developing the sureness of self he needs for the threatening process of growing up without the security of his own home.

The Child's Participation

However important the part that own parents and foster parents play in the child's placement, the child himself determines whether he can accept it. He is denied the fulfillment of life in his own home, and instead must live and grow, if he can, in a complicated setting wherein own parents, foster parents and agency all have a part. Foster care at best is an unnatural way of living against which the child struggles. We recognize the struggle as his effort to grow in the setting we provide. Hard as this process is, it can have dynamic value only if the structure of placement holds firm, whatever the child's response, retaining a strength which lets him find his own place.

What this means to any child is not for us to determine. He reacts to the separation from his own parents in the only way possible for him, and he responds to the new life of foster placement in terms of his own individuality. Its meaning, its problems, and its satisfactions come from within himself. But if there is to be the warm, living quality of growth in his participation, there must be freedom for the child to find and express the meaning which is real to him at each step he takes.

Whether a child rebels at coming to clinic, hates the clothing the agency provides, grows dissatisfied with his foster home, or takes all these things in his stride, he expresses as best he can what placement means for him. If we can support him by accepting his response, recognizing his necessity for it, and appreciating the valid feeling which prompts it, foster care becomes not a regimen which is imposed on him, but a living experience he can make his own. With the freedom he feels to participate in his own way, the reality of being a foster child assumes new meaning which is expressed in the changing quality of his response. This response may not be an increased acquiescence in the agency's procedure, for a child's ability to protest, instead of fitting in easily, may be a real evidence of growth. But our acceptance of his dissatisfaction with what we can offer may help him use this feeling, too, in his own development. As he is able to take into himself the experience of placement, realizing its changing and individual values, both positive and negative, accepting them, and finding a surer place for himself in foster care, he develops increasing ability to meet the perplexing problems of growth as a foster child. This is the child's part in placement, and ours is the delicate task of supporting him in it.

The Meaning of Separation

Foster children look forward with mixed feeling of fear, resentment, and welcome to the ending of agency care. Most of them express at times their longing for the day to come when they can be free of trips to clinic, or they ask with some anxiety how much longer the agency will pay their board in a foster home. But the children who find the most satisfaction in placement have less difficulty in leaving the agency when the time comes than those who are not able to make full use of it for their own growth. Here, as all through the experience, the child must meet the problems which are real to him. And here, too, our part in helping is to be clear and consistent in what we do, giving the child a place to participate but allowing him to do it in his own way.

I do not feel that we can have a separate program designed to prepare adolescents for assuming independence except as this preparation results from our process of helping the child to grow in responsibility for his own placement. The point at which the agency discontinues care must be determined, however, not by the child's growth, but by the real factors of the agency's resources and its responsibility to the community. On this basis, a definite procedure can be worked out which the child knows about in advance, and for which he has a part in planning.

I know of nothing harder than to hold fast to a program which puts this much burden on an adolescent child. Only as we feel sustained by our agency can we have the strength to do it. But that support, which the worker feels, is passed along, through her, to the child, who then may find it possible to accept agency procedure which is clearly defined and realistically determined. However, the fact that the child knows the agency policy and realizes its necessity does not automatically make him a responsible person. He responds on the basis of what the agency policies mean to him, and he depends on us to uphold him in the struggle that ensues. If we can grant him the right to have and express his own feeling without being carried away by it ourselves, then we provide freedom for the child to be fully responsible for what he does. Just as in the initial process, so in the child's steps toward leaving care, he must participate as he can and will. Our acceptance of that participation encourages its growth and helps the child to find, at this critical moment, the strength he needs to assume responsibility for himself.

Therapy With Placed Children

MARIAN B. NICHOLSON

THERAPY with children is a unique kind of situation in that its structure is lacking in most of the common elements of children's daily living: authoritative pressures, moral standards, accepted ideologies. After the initial experience of being brought, which represents to some degree the power of external authority, children move through a therapeutic experience pretty much in their own terms, in a situation made for them, with relation to a person who reacts to them as unique individuals. The kind of knowledge about children which is won from such a situation is also unique. It can throw little light upon past history and certainly cannot produce new facts; neither is it of much service for the prediction of how a child might be expected to adjust in the future to other kinds of situations. But it can illuminate, I think, the developmental processes of children as these are blocked by life-experiences and life-relationships. The question to which I want to direct your attention is this: What does this special kind of situation show us about placed children, their special needs, their problems in growing up?

I should like to begin by describing the early stages of a relationship just now being established with me by a little girl of six. This child, Lillian, has had a difficult life-experience so far. Her parents separated when she was under two years of age and she was boarded out privately for a few months, then placed with an agency. Several foster homes had to be tried out before one was found which could bear her jealousy, her fear and her tempers. Then, for three years or so, she got along fairly well and developed fairly satisfactorily, but with the advent into the home of another child she seemed to go to pieces. Another move was necessary. Fearful, jealous, destructive, unresponsive, lonely, unfriendly with other children, unable to achieve any success in school notwithstanding an average intelligence, this is the description of the little girl who was brought for treatment.

I, too, found her fearful and lonely underneath, but she was most careful to present herself as a very polite and obedient and clean little girl. This was probably, in part, at least her response to knowing that people were troubled about her behavior, though she had not been told that coming to me was connected with her badness. From the beginning she played a good deal with the dolls, and when she

talked of her babies it was obvious that she spoke about herself. For weeks her great concern was with badness and goodness; she told me how bad the two boys in the home were and how good she was herself; she asked if I would spank her should she ever be bad with me; she spent hours in washing the dolls and their clothing; she cleaned up her paint and her sawdust messes with meticulous care; she always asked permission to use the toys; the crayons which I sharpened for her were bad boys which I was to make good. I should like to give you some material from three different hours with Lillian, because it shows a child working through a conflict within herself, a conflict intensified by her experience as a placed child.

"Lillian was coloring a picture showing a boy and a girl standing beside a fence. She began to cough, evidently having a bad tickle in her throat. I suggested a drink, which she got, but it did not do much good. I was sure, from the conversation we had been having, that she was feeling especially fearful and so I said to her, 'Lillian, is it still scary to be coming here?' 'No,' she said, looking at me wide-eyed, 'there isn't anything scary here.' I said, 'No, maybe not, but I think perhaps you might be scared that if you happened to be bad I'd do something to you and you just might be bad some day.' 'Why do you think that?' she inquired. I said, 'Well, we were talking about that and I thought you did begin to get scary.' 'And then I coughed,' she said, 'and I couldn't stop.' We said no more about that, and she began to color another picture, this one showing a little girl knitting and a kitten playing with her ball of wool. We spoke of what the girl might be making and what color Lillian would choose for the wool, and then she wondered what the kitten would do with the ball. I said maybe he'd play with it so hard he would break it. 'That's just what he will do,' said she, indicating a point on the strand where the cat would break it. 'He'll take it away and then the girl can't finish her knitting. He'll play with it and he'll chew it up and he might even eat it. But what would it make him then?' she asked, in a panic. I said, 'Maybe just more cat, but maybe he is scared to eat it, because he thinks it would make him something he isn't.' 'That's what he is scared of,' said Lillian. She was coughing badly, but when she got over this spasm she was obviously feeling easier; her expression relaxed, she spoke more spontaneously, she began to hum to herself. 'Next time when I come I'm going to scare you,' she told me. 'I'm going to say, Boo! when I come in and you will be scared and you will jump.' I said, 'If anyone is to be scared, it had better be me.' 'What time is it?' she asked. 'Do I have to go yet? I'd love to live here.'"

"Lillian brought her Dy-dee doll with her today and promptly put it into a pan of water for a bath. After we had conversed about the badness of the boys in her home, Lillian got to talking about how the baby feels concerning many things, and I helped her carry the conversation on. I cannot reproduce it in detail but it contained the following material: Lillian's baby gets very dirty, gets dirty every day, gets bad and gets dirty; Lillian has to clean her up. But babies have to be a little bad. The baby's name is Miss G. (the name of Lillian's worker), but when she is older she will change that name back to her own name. The baby is hard to waken in the morning. (Here I probably said that perhaps the baby likes to go on dreaming.) She dreams about having lots of trucks and other toys that boys play with. The baby couldn't see her mother last week because her mother was sick. (Actu-

ally Lillian's own mother, whom she sees infrequently, was seriously ill in a hospital.) But her mother did get better. The baby gets lonely. She doesn't like to be all by herself. Next week perhaps I will help Lillian make her baby a slip such as my babies have. After the bath the baby was dressed and fed from a bottle. As she sat there holding the doll in her arms, Lillian began to talk as if to herself; at any rate she did not look at me and her back was turned to me. She said, in a sort of monotonous chant, 'She will eat if I nurse her. Yesterday I went to the cop and I asked him if she could have ten ounces. He said no. I went to the doctor and I asked him if she could have ten ounces and he said no. I asked him if she could have one ounce. He said yes. I asked him if she could have four ounces. He said no. I asked him if she could have three ounces. He said yes. Just a little at a time, he said. Three ounces is enough. Baby, have you had enough? Do you want mother to finish the bottle? All right, I will.' And so she drank from the bottle herself."

"Lillian brought her baby again today but was a little hesitant about taking off its blanket. When I asked whether the baby had been hard to waken this morning she replied, 'No, she woke up before I did and I said, Do you want to go with me today? and she said she did. Her name's Nancy, did I tell you? Since she started to be good it's Nancy.' Lillian spoke of giving the baby a bath, but actually she left it on a chair and paid no more attention to it. We were to write each other letters, she told me. First I should write to her and then she would reply. 'But you'll have to show me how to write Lillian,' said she. I printed her name in block letters; she copied it, and her copy was her reply. Then she said, 'I want to write a letter about love but I don't know how to write that, either.' And so I gave her the word, printed, and she copied it for her reply to me. 'You didn't know I could write this good, did you?' she asked. The child was fairly transfigured today, her face alive, her eyes shining, her manner easy and confident. I saw no trace of fear in her."

All that I want to say has now been said, and I hope that, as I try to make it more explicit, my clumsy efforts may not dull your recognition of Lillian's precise and delicate intuitions. The first point I want to emphasize concerns the child's connection between being good and being accepted by me. For weeks her efforts were directed toward proving that she was good because she was able to show herself as clean, polite and careful. Her fear, as she herself told me, was not aroused because of anything actually intimidating in the situation but because I had the power to exclude her—literally at the end of each visit—and emotionally to reject her. All this while my activity was based upon an identification with her, that is, an understanding of her effort to hide her badness and an acceptance of her impulses as such, quite beyond any content, bad or good. Feeling this, she felt included, she felt likeness. Fear, which was based on her equation, Different is Bad, was overcome. But also her corresponding equation, Good is Like, could be felt as true apart from any content of cleanliness or obedience or politeness. This is, of course, a primitive concept of good, but it is the one with which children begin. Good is being included.

This child, like all children, feels her own impulses and will as bad, because different, and therefore she strives to disguise them. She will be good in adult

terms in order to be included, to be like, but she can manage only this when someone else moves toward her first, when someone else includes her as she is, without demanding too much change. When a child feels too completely excluded, too different, too bad, he is compelled to affirm himself by being more bad because he is unable to create the whole of likeness, goodness. This child, like so many placed children, has been excluded, not once but many times. The first rejection by her parents was perhaps the decisive one in response to which she set her attitude to herself and the world. Perhaps she has never, since that time, allowed herself to be included, or perhaps no one has ever been able to include her. Her fear is great but so is her need. The goodness that is wholeness and likeness is what she most wants, what she must feel before she can develop further.

It is well for those of us who work with placed children to remind ourselves often that children are not the whole of themselves, that their personalities do not reside entirely within their own skins, that their egos are not yet built up as separate egos. Someone else who can identify with them, who can receive their projections, whom they can re-create continuously in terms of their changing needs: this is the presupposition for their ability to build up personality and this is the source of their identifications. Just to live in a home is not necessarily to feel thus included and "like." And it would be difficult indeed for anyone to include in feeling a child with Lillian's range of problem for twenty-four hours a day. Her intensity of fear would keep her from accepting offered warmth lest she lose herself in it, or lose it again. And thus difficulty accumulates: fear, rejection of likeness, recognition of separateness and badness, more bad behavior, then being rejected actually. Lillian rejects first so as to run no chance of being rejected.

Children come into the world already some distance along a course of physical growth which, under favorable circumstances, proceeds according to its own laws: from smaller to larger, milk teeth falling out at a certain time and permanent ones emerging, changing relation of head-size to body-size, toward biological maturity, and so on. The development of a self is hardly growth in this sense. It is more an active utilization of what is given biologically and what is available in experience, in the interests of the individual. In primitive societies the material for children's development seems to come largely from the group as a whole, but the child of our civilization develops in relation to individuals, usually in terms of one individual. The small child, feeling himself

included in the ego of his mother, feels safe, protected from fear, and even, perhaps, physically well. On this passive basis he begins an active identifying of his own, taking what he needs, building up a self. If the support is lacking, the development goes awry. All this is implied when we say that children are dependent. Literally, they cannot develop alone.

The behavior of children is thus to be understood as reaction, not in the sense that the situation causes the behavior, but in the meaning of children's dependence as I have just described it. Their responses are their own, are not caused in any external sense, but the responses are given to what is present in the situation or to what is lacking or to what has been present and has been taken away. It follows that we can never expect psychological treatment to make a child responsible for his behavior. So long as he is a child he will continue to need support in his developing. We can hope that it will reduce his fear enough so that he will be able to accept the material available to him. We can hope to set going in him again the life-process, the ability to put out and to take in. This would be the limit of our hope even if he were brought by his own parent, for in that case not the child's response only but the relationship between child and parent to which both contribute would constitute the problem to be worked out.

The second point I want to emphasize is Lillian's revelation of the process through which she became able to feel enough likeness to be ready to take something. I have spoken of her use of the dolls as herself. You have noted also, of course, similar uses of other objects. The bad boys in the home were pictures of a part of herself; so was the naughty kitten who would like to eat up the little girl's wool. So was I—I myself was made over several times to suit her need. I was the doctor and the cop, the fearsome mother who might spank her should she be bad and the good one who fed and comforted children. But this only means that at different times I stood for different aspects of herself. Actually my attitude to her had been limited to one of identifying with her. Lillian had done what every child does, she had built her life-experiences into her ego, but the corresponding process, the putting out again, was lacking in sufficient degree to enable her to go on developing. She had carried about with her the fears and the conflict of a much younger child. Treatment for her is, first of all, an unburdening, a getting rid of burdensome attitudes and feelings and impulses. She had tried to do this often enough, but the result was only to get herself further into trouble because of the intensity of her need and her fear. In this situation she

could make me into a forbidding, punishing power and so personify and locate her destructive impulses. She could then re-create me into a personification of the maternal principle under whose protection she could begin to unfold and develop, could make me beneficently powerful and thus idealize herself. "You didn't know I could write so good, did you?" she says.

The trouble with this child is not so much that she experienced trauma and frustration at some time in the past as that she has not found a way of depositing conflict currently, and therefore she goes on adding to difficulty. Obviously, difficulty originates at some point in time, but it can hardly be said to be "caused" in an external sense by any occurrence; the unique reaction to the occurrence is there too. Children seem to take into themselves and to build into their egos restrictions and traumatic experiences in a way foreign to adult experience and understanding. Thus, we say: Don't do this thing; but children seem to take from the prohibition the meaning: I should not do anything you do not wish me to do and if I go ahead I am bad. An experience of rejection, therefore, can be taken by a child in terms of a general attitude to his ego; but that means, in terms of his ability to externalize himself and to make new identifications—in other words, to develop. The natural life-process is interfered with. He is unable to find appropriate places in which to deposit the painful attitude to himself. He does not necessarily need to do so in the terms in which it was first experienced, but in terms of how it is felt today, here and now. What prevents him from doing this is fear.

The human organism seems to know how to handle the effects of trauma, perhaps learns this through being born, by handling other and smaller units of anxiety, thus binding and conquering the experience. But Lillian had to go through a total anxiety time after time, and for some reason which we cannot know was never able to feel safe enough, whole enough, like enough, to ease herself of her burden. In the treatment experience the child was able to objectify her fear little by little, in one small circumstance after another, being afraid to come and then afraid of being sent out. She was able to be rid of her painful attitudes to herself by thus putting them outside her; then she could begin to go further. She could hint at badness and power of her own, admit them verbally, and finally demonstrate them without being caught in consequences too serious for her. As she herself tells us, a little at a time is enough.

The medium in which this is done is, of course,

play. In the magic belief that is natural to children any object she chooses can represent herself or a part of it or that portion of reality which she is trying to master; in re-creating the object in her own image she can truly re-create herself. If the baby learns to nurse, so can Lillian learn to take; if the kitten can eat and stay himself, so can she. The word "Love," written on paper, is the sign of her own positive attitude to herself in relation to the world, the symbol of an out-going taking possession of it, a maternalization of it. All these things are outside her, yet the forces for which they stand are within. The outside objects can be used, arranged, controlled, re-created, and as she handles them her inner conflicts take an actual form in which they are capable of being solved.

My third point concerns an aspect of Lillian's experience which belongs to the future. After a while, in some weeks or months, the situation will offer her no more challenge. She will seek to find in it elements which it does not and cannot possess. She will have created it for herself over and over again to suit her changing need, but just the fact that she is free to do so will mark the limits of its usefulness to her. Her need to control her own impulses finds in treatment no external standard to lend it form and actuality, no strong emotion on which to develop her own emotional life. She will turn away from it, turn to outer reality which is able to set standards for her, to limit her, to give her the emotions of people in real situations. She will turn to her worker and her foster mother who stand for real experiences, real tasks to be met and mastered, real persons, not wholly made by herself. Actually this turning begins at the very moment in which she feels accepted by me as she is. At that point her letters are written to her mother and are taken home, her play with me assumes a different and a less intense character, her symbols become less cosmic and more literal.

This child stood in need of learning two lessons: how to approach the new without too much fear, and how to leave the old when that is necessary either because of outside change or inner development. The first lesson she has learned, not in terms of content but in essence. The second is even more important. If she can learn it, the learning will in itself cancel the faulty learnings of her early childhood. At that time it will be necessary that I, knowing her in treatment, and her worker, who knows her in her own family and in her present home, work together closely on

matters of her real life. Our different kinds of knowledge about the child will be supplementary. I shall know what progress she has made in developing strength and organization of herself. Her worker will know how she is using that self and the resources of her home. Together we may be able to help her go from her present temporary home into one which can be her own. She may have to go through quite a struggle before she can give up the relationship which she is helping to create; I expect that, because she is putting much of herself into the creation. We may both need to help her move toward her new opportunities, conserving as much as possible of what she has taken and what she has developed. Were Lillian a child coming for treatment with her own parent, this problem would still exist, but it would not be so difficult for her to handle, provided that the parent had done her part in reconstructing the painful relationship, because the new would already be launched upon in reality. Lillian's task will be much harder. Her new reality is yet to be given her. Everything that her worker and I may know about helping children to use experience, bit by bit, will be of value here as we try to help her bridge the chasm which separates her learning in a protected spot from the use of it in real life.

I should like to conclude with a few sentences from a book about children. The author is Walter de la Mare:

"Most adults . . . are at least friendly to childhood and to children. With a benevolent eye they watch their gambols, are amused at their primitive oddities, give what they suppose to be the countersign, and depart. A few take children as they take one another, just as they come, welcome them for what they are, refrain from making advances, and are gladly admitted on these terms into the confraternity. The very few—as few in books as in life—have the equivalent of what the born gardener is blessed with—a green thumb. He can pluck up a plant and without the least danger examine its roots. . . . Such are the various degrees of approach between the grown-up and the young, from sheer insensitiveness to the rarest insight and understanding. And yet, I believe those who can win nearest to childhood, and be wholly at peace, at liberty, and at ease in its company, would be the first to acknowledge that they can never get nearer than very near, never actually there."

Case Work Service in a Day Nursery*

DOROTHY CURTIS MELBY

FROM all parts of these United States one hears today the cry of the need for day care for children of working mothers. Immediately we are face to face with the problem of the quality of care these children and their families are going to be offered. With the demand so greatly increased, is it possible to hold fast to those standards of service which make it possible for children to have care which would contribute to their growth and development and for mothers to work and contribute constructively to the stability of the family? Can we afford to hold to that which we have learned or shall we set aside useful procedures "for the duration"? Knowing how destructive wholesale plans for the care of children may be, can we afford not to use, with ever more skill, thoughtfully worked out case work methods?

Knowing the problems which have been presented in application in one day nursery in the last four months, and knowing that these problems are present at application in any agency which sets itself up to give day care for children, can we dare provide any less considerate program lest these mothers in going to work lose the very thing for which they are working, lose the very thing for which we believe we are fighting?

Problem for the Woman Who Works

In Baltimore, a center for defense industries, employment opportunities for both men and women are plentiful. Any woman who has a desire to get a job may find one. Indeed, daily through the newspaper and over the radio she is urged to accept employment. But the woman who has children, whatever her reason for going to work, must make some provision for them. She may leave them on the street, with a neighbor or a relative, who perhaps doesn't want them. What does this mean in the cost to the child, to the family, and to the community? Entering industry may mean her chance to get away from a rejected child, from hated housework, from an unbearable marital situation; a chance to get away and at the same time feel that she is being patriotic. She is doing her share to help win the war. She may not realize that, by going to work, she may easily be increasing the very problem she is trying to escape. And in the long run the problem of neglected and unloved children may be more costly to the country

than her inability to go to work now. Even for the woman whose employment is desirable from every angle there arise real problems and difficulties in the mere separation of the child from his family, problems which need consideration of the parents and those who care for the child.

Questions Facing the Day Nursery

Are the problems brought to and the questions facing the day nursery today different from those brought in normal times?

In a neighborhood where there is a well-established day nursery parents have always turned to them for help. We have found this to be true in East Baltimore, where the Salvation Army has operated a day nursery for more than forty years. This day nursery, as it exists today, is the combination of a nursery school and a social agency.

Because of the increased opportunities and need for women to work, our applications at times this year have been four times as great as they were for the corresponding period a year ago. There have been as many as fifty children on a waiting list when our capacity is only sixty-seven. Yet in the days of custodial care this same building housed ninety-seven children. With such a waiting list, should we attempt to again admit more children, crowding our groups? Or have we learned enough about what can happen to a little child in too large a group to insist that small groups be provided for those who really need to be cared for in this manner? With such a waiting list, should we modify our carefully planned application process and accept children more quickly? This would require less of the time of both the applicant and the social worker. Or knowing what happens to a child who enters the nursery today and leaves tomorrow or next week, shall we allow the necessary time for the parents to make a decision that is likely to hold, to refuse or to accept the services of the day nursery or perhaps of another agency?

There are thousands of people coming to Baltimore to secure work. Families with little children often come with the intention of only the father securing work, but upon arrival find that there is a chance, and a real need, for the mother to enter industry. Day nurseries must be ready to accept some of these children. But they also must be able to help the parents make a plan for their children which is satisfactory to both the child and his parents, for then,

* A paper on Foster Family Day Care will appear in the June issue of the BULLETIN.

and then only, will the mother be free to work and the child free to grow.

Many other questions arise in the minds of those who are interested not only in day care for children but in any of the services for children. Now that the community encourages women to work as against the feeling before the war that her place is in the home, what kinds of problems are families trying to solve by having their children cared for in a day nursery? Are they going to work because there is work to be done regardless of the cost to the child or to the family? Are they confusing the value of additional income with other values in family living? Are they trying to substitute day care for children when they need the services of a family agency? Are they trying to substitute day care when foster boarding care is needed?

Then there are those who question the need for case work services, those who think of day care as a nursery school experience. They question why a family needs the help of a social worker to decide about day care for a child when no such service exists for the child entering nursery school? Why cannot the parent and teacher carry the complete responsibility of the child's separation from his family?

Problems Encountered in Application

Perhaps if we examine the kind of problems parents present when they apply to a day nursery we may begin to find what is necessary in order that this service be effectively utilized.

When the M.'s came to Baltimore Mr. M. secured a well-paying job in a defense industry, earning more than he had ever earned before. Mrs. M. had never worked, had never planned to work. When she discovered a chance to pay off those debts which had accumulated back home during the lean years of the depression, she jumped at it. It would be a simple matter, she thought, to leave four-year-old Alice at the nursery down the street. She had seen the children playing happily in the park. But when she came in to apply and together with the social worker began to plan for vaccination and inoculation and medical examination it was as if for the first time she considered her little girl as an individual, with feelings and rights of her own. And as she went through the pain of doing these things with Alice, the need for additional income and employment loomed less urgent. Alice became more important. But it was not until Alice actually left her and went with the nursery school teacher to play with the children that Mrs. M. knew that she could not bear for another person to care for her child at this time. It seemed to her that she was just getting acquainted with Alice for the first time, Alice whom she had always taken for granted.

We know from sad experience that mothers like Mrs. M. place and replace their children, try job after job, and finally give up with an utter sense of failure, to say nothing of how harmful such experiences must be for the child. It may well be possible

that should a compelling necessity for her to work arise, Mrs. M. will be able to do so and make a satisfactory plan for her child because of what she has lived through in this application process.

Nearly always when a parent comes to the day nursery she comes with the idea of "leaving" her child or with a request for someone to "mind" her child. On the surface it seems to her, and often to the community, as simple as that. More often than not she is acting on an impulse to go to work, or on an impulse to be rid of her child. Rarely does she know what this move involves either for herself or for her child. If discriminating help is not given at the time of the application, the child may be admitted without his parent ever knowing this thing she is doing. And should day nursery care fail, as it often must, the day nursery has only added to her confusion though its intent was to help.

There was Mrs. W., who would have left her children immediately.

She was so confused in her feelings about her husband and her children. She had left her husband and had gone to live with relatives, knowing that this was only a temporary plan. She did not know what she wanted either for herself or for her children. She had secured employment but worked sporadically. In her first interview at the day nursery she was not able to think even of having her children vaccinated, or of the opening and closing hours. And neither was she able to consider foster boarding care at this time although she had indicated that someone must take the children. But when Mrs. W. was told that it might be possible to reestablish her home, she was able to accept referral to a family agency.

What service would it have been to Mrs. W. and her children if she had been left to find out by placing her children in a nursery school that this could not help her with the solution of her problem. What useless waste of limited facilities for children of working mothers! Nor would this have been a contribution toward increased production in the war program. Mrs. W. was not able to hold a job for any length of time and was not able to learn a new skill while struggling with such conflicts about her family.

Many confused parents come to us because they want their child "out of the way." It is these parents who would give entire responsibility of their children to the day nursery on the day of application. It is these parents who in the days before case work invaded the day nursery brought their children in one day and took them out the next, and brought their children only as regularly as it was "convenient" to do so. These same parents work irregularly and have little or no organization in their home life. These parents learn in application that they cannot carry a consistent, responsible-sharing relationship with the agency who is set up to care for the child during

the day. They either go on in their own pattern or accept referral elsewhere for help.

Mrs. K. came in to apply for her two little boys, John and Bobby. When she found that she could not see the social worker immediately, she was so upset that a schedule was rearranged so that she could have an appointment later the same day. During this interview, because her children could not be admitted at once, she decided to give up her job until June, when she could get a school girl to look after the children.

A school girl would not bother her about vaccination, be concerned about contagious diseases, or about a schedule for play. Had we accepted the children at once she probably would have taken them out as soon as they encountered the first obstacle.

Some disturbed parents sense for the first time the satisfaction of doing for and with one's own child, and in this sharing experience find challenging the impetus to accept responsibility for themselves and for their children.

Mr. and Mrs. R. existed in two small back alley rooms. Neither of them had ever held a job. They apparently had never done anything regularly and steadily. They had taken little or no interest in Elizabeth and Josie, until those two small daughters became wild, unruly little creatures demanding that someone take notice of them. Mr. and Mrs. R. took the path of least resistance. They decided to "leave" them in the nursery nearest their home. But when in the application interview they found a nursery worker who was not only interested in children but had a real concern for the parents as well as for the problems with their children, they were able to move toward doing something for the children themselves, which was quite different from merely "leaving" them in a day nursery. When they took their second step in applying, which was to bring Elizabeth and Josie for a physical examination they had transformed the dirty, ragged little girls to ones with clean faces and wearing new dresses. Each time thereafter when the nursery required participation of these parents (because we believe a nursery has no right under any condition to assume parental prerogatives), they have responded not only with more interest in their children but more interest in all of living.

Alone they could not maintain a family but with the help of the nursery they could have a birthday party for a child. They could join with other parents and the nursery staff in planning a carnival to raise money for equipment for use in the nursery. And with someone sharing the care of the children Mr. and Mrs. R. have been able to work regularly, increasing their income and have moved to better living quarters.

Then there are the parents who have been working for some time and have tried leaving their children with a neighbor or relatives, or have employed a girl by the day to look after the children. When none of these plans is satisfactory, they turn to the day nursery. Sometimes with the help of the social worker in application they find the only solution to their problem is foster boarding care, since having their child cared for during the day is not enough. This is especially true when a parent lets her desire to work overshadow her real difficulty with her child. Some-

times these parents find that group care for the child and a responsibly, sustained relationship with the day nursery social worker may hold for them possibilities of further development.

We have, too, the parents who come to make a plan for their children before seeking employment. Their number is not great. For them as well as the less adequate does not the day nursery with its nursery school need to provide a well developed program? These parents as well as parents who apply for other reasons need to understand and feel a share in the day program of their child. Mr. and Mrs. P. were such parents.

He and his wife had come to Baltimore for the purpose of entering the defense industries. They were buying a farm in another state. They secured tenants for their farm and seized upon the opportunity to work in defense industries in order to earn money to meet the monthly payments. They believed that it was possible for both of them to work and also to responsibly plan for Jackie, although they had tried two unsuccessful plans before applying to our day nursery. It was soon apparent that Jackie was secure with his parents and able to take the children and the new toys in his stride. And as we gave Mr. and Mrs. P. an opportunity to become acquainted with every phase of nursery living before Jackie entered, they expressed that it was "like a new world opening up gradually for Jackie." And when the application was completed and Jackie was ready to enter, Mr. P. with a great deal of feeling exclaimed, "I like the way you do things."

Now Mr. and Mrs. P. are working steadily on implements of war, giving themselves fully to their task with a peace of mind that comes with knowing where Jackie is and what he is doing.

And for the parent and child who have been referred by a pediatrician, a psychiatrist, or the Child Study Association a skillfully carried out application process is essential. Usually this child is referred because of some difficult behavior problem. Those, whether social workers or nursery school teachers, who have had any experience with this child know that much of what can be accomplished in the group for and with him is dependent upon the understanding, the participation, and the acceptance of any plan by the child's parent.

Necessity for Skill

Time and skill must be used when parents come to apply for day care for their children if they are to have a chance to become acquainted with and be able to accept a day nursery with all of its limitations and its advantages. An opportunity should be given to a parent to know what health requirements they must meet as well as the health protection a nursery offers his child. The parent should be given an opportunity to observe the children in the nursery to see for herself what kind of children are likely to

become her child's friend, where the food is prepared, the kind of food served. And the child we are accepting and planning for should certainly have a chance to participate in entering. We know that some children can defeat the best laid plans. The child, with the help of his parent and the nursery staff, needs to get acquainted with the nursery bit by bit—the doctor, the nursery school teacher, the toys, the children. If parents and their children are given this opportunity when they apply, they either accept day nursery care for their child with a conviction about what they are doing, a conviction which enables them to go on with their own plans, and gives freedom and time to the child to live and grow in a group; or they accept referral to another agency or make other plans for themselves.

And even though the pressure from the outside for women to work caused by a war economy brings more parents to a day nursery seeking help, we find that their own needs and inner pressures are no different, that the problems of family relationships are no different and that the problems created by the very separation of parent and child are no different. The behavior, the growth and development of the child, and his relationship to the nursery and his home are no different.

The Need to be Met

Essentially then the problems coming to a day nursery in a large defense area are no different from the problems brought in peace time. And as the Field Secretary of the National Association of Day

Nurseries reviewed our applications she was convinced that they might be applications in New York, in Boston, in Atlanta. They were no different because of the war or because Baltimore is a center for defense industries. As was true in the years of depression, the largest number of families still apply because the father is unable to earn enough to maintain the family. Because of war priorities many men are earning less since the companies for which they worked for years are unable to get materials. Some men are earning the same amount they earned last year and because of the increased cost of living cannot meet expenses. The next largest group apply because the parents are separated. The mother is capable of both earning a living and keeping her children. The rest of the parents are applying and are using the day nursery for a variety of reasons: illness of one or the other parent, death of the father, inability of the mother to cope with a difficult child, behavior problem of the child, inability of both parents to maintain a family without help, marital difficulties, divorce, and illegitimacy.

For the child who cannot adjust in a group, for young babies who should not be in day nurseries, for children too old for a nursery program, foster day care is essential. It is also necessary to meet the problem of the woman whose working hours are long and irregular and for the woman who does not live near a day nursery. The Henry Watson Children's Aid Society of Baltimore has begun a foster day care program to demonstrate the value of another way of meeting the increased need for day care.

Constructive Use of the Children's Court

BARBARA C. BRYER

TO many case workers, S.P.C.C. work has seemed and unfortunately still does seem to belong outside the field of modern case work practice. To them, as to many parents, it means that the "agent" ruthlessly picks up the children from their homes, subjects them to a destructive court experience with resulting commitment, and later placement without regard to its devastating effects on child as well as parent. To me, S.P.C.C. work seems to have gone far beyond this and now involves all modern case work skills in an even more challenging and stimulating manner.

This deprecable feeling seems to have arisen in part from the belief that there is inherent in the protective function an authority vested in the court as our agent which is an obstacle or hindrance to the free functioning of professional skills. In practice, however, this authority seems to have many constructive uses and to be a resource as acceptable and useful to the client as any other community resource.

Previously some have felt that our authority, that is, our right to use the court authoritatively, is an end in itself. Case work skill is tried and when this approach fails we give up and resort to the court. It

seems there has been something almost retributive in our use of the court as a last resort. We have tried our best case work skill—the client has been “uncooperative”—now we will call the court into the situation and have them “lay down the law” so that the client will have to conform. How could an experience approached in this manner be constructive or helpful to anyone?

With our realization that the neglect or abuse of children by parents is not generally so planned, but that there is usually a reason less obvious than that which appears on the surface, if we can get to that reason, there may be much relief in actually working on a plan with the court for the good of the child. The parent doesn't just want to bruise his child or let him go cold and hungry, and the cause of this behavior is generally the focus of our treatment with the parent. The parent's own problems in relation to himself or the child are causative factors for this behavior. Though neglect seems severe and “rejection” serious, and it appears that immediate removal by court action is advisable, it is often not necessary when the factors making the client behave in this manner are understood by him. With increased realization of his own problem in this his need to “take out” his own feelings on his child is lessened.

Sometimes it is impossible for the parent to live with the child any longer and placement is necessary while he copes with his own part and problem in the situation. At such times he may let the child go willingly. At other times the neglect seems so serious that immediate removal is felt necessary and we use the remand order giving us immediate temporary custody of the child. This is used by us and the court only when we feel that the child, if left in the home, would suffer more from the parent's behavior than by placement. The neglect or abuse is serious at the time, but the parents, with help and understanding, may later be able to reestablish their home and provide adequately for the child.

Today our thinking is that the court can be used constructively as a part of the total case work plan with the parents. It need not necessarily be a threat, lurking in the background, to the parent, that the court may take his children and he no longer have his rightful control over his children. In some situations the court offers a medium of expression to the client's problem which interviews and verbalization fail to provide.

Take Mrs. W., for example. She brought her year-old son to us for placement. The problems, both financial and emotional, in keeping the child with her were too great for her to cope with. The child was

being neglected because the sacrifices which were demanded of her in giving the child adequate care were too great for her to bear.

It seemed best to place the child immediately and a foster home was selected. Mrs. W. was not able to accept the foster home—it was too great a threat to her. She complained of the care the child was receiving and demanded replacement or a return of the child to her home. Since it had been a voluntary arrangement, the child was returned to her with the realization that a replacement with her present attitude was useless. Again, after several months of struggling to maintain a home for the child, during which time she failed miserably to do this adequately, she returned to us, again asking for placement.

It was explained to Mrs. W. that we did not feel a voluntary placement would be any more effective or beneficial than the last attempt. We felt, in view of the circumstances, that it might be advisable to refer the matter to the Children's Court and have a decision made by which we all could abide. It was a threat at first—an acknowledgment of her own inadequacies. She was afraid that the judge would criticize and blame her when she was not sure she deserved blame. She liked the child, thought she wanted him with her, but admitted that she was not able to work things out satisfactorily for herself or the child.

When court action was explained to her as an opportunity to work out an acceptable plan for herself and the welfare of the child, she accepted court action. The child was removed by a voluntary surrender with the understanding (as always) that if and when she was in a position to maintain an adequate home she might apply for his return.

The child has been successfully placed. The mother has been able to accept the placement as the best plan that could be worked out for her and the child. She has the feeling that the court was just as interested in his welfare as she was and that the plan for placement was a cooperative thing between her and the court. She feels that she had a part in this plan and consequently can accept it. She is relieved that she was not forced to give up her child when she knew she really wanted to keep him, and is accepting of the plan made because she shared in the decision. She is functioning adequately on her job and not bothering or criticizing the foster parents, who are really no better equipped to handle him than the first foster parents. She is planning for his eventual return but wants to make sure this time that his return will be for good. In the meantime she is content with the court's plan, which was really her own, but one which she was not able to put into effect without help from

the court in making this decision. It has made for greater possibilities of the child's adjustment in his foster home without the interference of an upset mother. The court decision seemed to give the mother a strength on which she could organize her own thinking and reach a decision which was in accord with the best interests of the child.

Again, take June, a sixteen-year-old girl, the child of divorced parents, who, to quote June, was "willed" to her mother. She lived with her mother until her father was finally able to buy her affections with offers of material things—clothes, a horse, a dog, etc. June went to live with her father, who was afraid to discipline her because June always threatened to return to her mother (which her father did not want), so he gave in to her every wish. June played one parent against the other, so she always got her own way.

At fourteen she began getting into minor difficulties, which her father always excused or repaid, so June never had to suffer the consequences of or be responsible for her actions. Her delinquencies became more serious until truancy became a major problem. Court action was suggested to the mother, but she refused saying that she wanted to save June from that "disgrace."

The situation continued to grow worse with June having her own way more and more, until this fall, when we felt that court action with possible placement was June's only salvation. It was again suggested to the mother and she readily agreed to the plan as she realized that June was not getting along well under the present arrangement. Later, with pressure from the father as to the "disgrace" it would bring June, the mother hesitated. However, when the choice was left to her of a court hearing or taking out working papers for June, which would relieve the truancy problem and thus rule out our only basis for court action, she chose court action. She gave as her reasons for this choice her belief that the court would suggest only plans which they felt were for June's best interest, and that signing June out of school was not really meeting June's need. She felt, however, that if the working papers were the solution, that the court would recommend this plan and it could be tried. Her fear of the court as an authoritative body was gone when she realized that they too were inter-

ested in working out the soundest plan for June's welfare.

An informal truancy hearing was arranged, where plans were made to give June another chance to make good. The decision as to whom she wanted to live with was left to June and she selected her mother with the understanding that this was a final choice and that she could no longer go back and forth between her parents just to satisfy her own ends. A new school program was worked out with June and she had the opportunity of starting out on a clean slate, so to speak. The case was left on a day to day basis with the understanding that if this plan was not successful the case be returned to court for a further decision. The mother asked that the Children's Aid Society remain interested in the situation so that she might discuss with us from time to time anything which arose and was troublesome to her. The mother felt that the court action had lent a dignity and impressiveness to the situation that could not have come from any other source. She was satisfied with the court decision and went ahead to work toward the success of this plan with renewed enthusiasm.

These brief illustrations represent two of the many ways in which court action can become an integral part of a sound case work plan, agreed upon by the parent and without authority or threat. The court, with its very legality, offers to the client a strength on which the client can begin to build constructively. Its decision must be accepted or a new one made if it is impossible to comply with the original decree, and for some it is easier to change and make more constructive plans with this decision as a starting point.

Though commonly believed, the Children's Aid Society has no more authority than any individual citizen—no more legal power to use the court automatically than the average person in the community. When the belief in our influence with the court is corrected and the court introduced into a case work plan as any other resource is used, I believe we will find clients using it constructively and to their own advantage. If the court action is part of the total treatment plan worked out with the client, as any other plan is, it can be accepted by him and the case work continue without hostility on his part for our authoritative action.